Dear Sir/Madam

You are hereby invited to attend a meeting of the Ards and North Down Borough Council which will be held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, The Castle, Bangor on Wednesday, 26 September 2018 commencing at 7.00pm.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Reid
Chief Executive
Ards and North Down Borough Council

AGENDA

1. Prayer
2. Apologies
3. Declarations of Interest
4. Mayor’s Business
5. Mayor and Deputy Mayor Engagements for the Month (To be tabled)
6. Minutes of Meeting of Council dated 29 August 2018 (Copy attached)
7. Minutes of Committees (Copies attached)
   7.1. Special Planning Committee dated 21 August 2018
   7.2. Planning Committee dated 4 September 2018
   7.3. Environment Committee dated 5 September 2018
   7.4. Regeneration and Development Committee dated 6 September 2018
   7.5. Corporate Services Committee dated 11 September 2018
   7.6. Newtownards Town Steering Group 11 September 2018
   7.7. Community and Wellbeing Committee dated 12 September 2018
8. Requests for Deputation
   8.1. Renewal of Lease Bryansburn Football Club
   8.2. Mr Alan McIlwaine – Compostable Garden Waste
9. Conferences, Invitations etc.

9.1 Item Withdrawn


10. Northern Ireland Travel Awards – Best Visitor Information Centre 2018 (Report attached)


12. Further Request for Nomination at Social Enterprise Awards 2018 (Report attached)

13. Sealing Documents

14. Transfer of Rights of Burial

15. Notices of Motion Status Report (Report attached)

16. Notices of Motion

16.1. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Chambers

I respectfully request Officers to prepare a report on the need for a playpark facility in the Towerview area with a view to including it within the existing strategy going forward.

16.2. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Muir, Woods, Girvan, Robinson, Walker and Wilson

That this Council notes the Fieldwork Report from Phase 1 – Building Capacity in Communities in Transition (Kilcooley & Rathgill), commits to the message that “Paramilitaries Have No Place” and requests that Officers bring back a report in relation to the recommendations made including, but not limited to, development of clear protocols for engaging with paramilitary groups and individuals.

16.3 Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman Girvan and Alderman McDowell

Given the significant increase and projected increase of housing developments in Comber, Lisbane, Ballygowan and Killinchy that this Council writes to the Department of Infrastructure to ask what plans they have to develop Phase 3 of the Comber Bypass i.e. from the Killinchy Street roundabout to the Ballygowan Road, Comber, to reduce the anticipated increased volume of traffic that will pass through the centre of the town.
16.4 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Boyle and Councillor McAlpine

That this Council agrees to write to the Divisional Manager DfI Roads – Southern Division, Simon Richardson, responsible for the Strangford Ferry Service, asking for a rescheduling of their current timetable to commence at 7.15am rather than 7.45am, to meet with the noticeably increasing needs and requirements of their regular early morning customers wishing to avail of this service.

16.5. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Muir and Alderman Smith

That this Council agrees to move the “Welcome to Crawfordsburn’ sign to the village settlement boundary on the Ballyrobert Road.

16.6 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cathcart

In line with the Council’s desire to improve our blue and greenways as part of the Integrated Tourism, Regeneration and Economic Development Strategy, this Council looks to improve the upper coastal path between Pickie Fun Park and Smelt Mill Bay. Whilst the long-term future of this area will be addressed in the Bangor Coastal Masterplan, in the short-term the Council asks for an officer’s report to consider minor works to improve the appearance and tourism potential of the area. Proposals will consider removal of trees and shrubbery to open up wonderful sea views, graffiti removal, the relocation of benches and potential new signage.

16.7 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cathcart

This Council, as part of its desire to improve the Borough’s environment, asks for an officer’s report, following appropriate health and safety assessments, on the removal of litter from inside the sea barriers along the Eisenhower and Pickie piers at Bangor Marina.

16.8. Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman Henry and Councillor Smart

That this Council notes that Northern Ireland has the highest suicide rate of any region of the United Kingdom. In Ards and North Down statistics show that in 10 years 2006 to 2016 there were 200 who were recorded as losing their lives to suicide.

We must remind anyone in distress or despair that support is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Urge anyone with suicidal thoughts to immediately contact their GP or any of the brilliant Mental Health charities for help.

Council notes also that funding of Mental Health Services across Northern Ireland remains inadequate and expresses outrage that the ongoing political impasse at Stormont has meant that Protect Life 2 – the new strategy and action plan to reduce our suicide rate has still not been published due to the absence of a Local Minister.
We agree to write to the Secretary of State to emphasis to her that the current situation is unacceptable and urge her to intervene to secure the immediate publication of this strategy.

**COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE**

17. Environmental Warden Contract (Report attached)
18. Portavogie 3G Pitch (Report attached)
19. Belfast Region City Deal (To follow)
20. NILGA Local Government Awards Ceremony (Report attached)
21. NILGA Consultation: Devolution within Northern Ireland (Report attached)
22. Tender for Design Contract for Ballycopeland Windmill (To follow)
23. Food Destination Development Plan 2018-2021 (Report attached)
24. Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing & Leisure Complex – Additional Pool Plant Costs (To follow)

Circulated for Information

(a) Department for Communities – Birthday Honours 2019 (Correspondence attached)
(b) Northern Ireland Water – September 2018 Edition of Waterline (Copy attached)

MEMBERSHIP OF ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alderman Carson</th>
<th>Councillor Dunlop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Fletcher</td>
<td>Councillor Dunne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Gibson</td>
<td>Councillor Edmund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Girvan</td>
<td>Councillor Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Graham</td>
<td>Councillor Gilmour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Henry</td>
<td>Councillor Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Irvine</td>
<td>Councillor Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Keery</td>
<td>Councillor Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman McDowell</td>
<td>Councillor McAlpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Smith</td>
<td>Councillor McClean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Councillor McIlveen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Allen</td>
<td>Councillor Menagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Armstrong-Cotter</td>
<td>Councillor Muir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Boyle</td>
<td>Councillor Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Brooks</td>
<td>Councillor Smart (Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Cathcart</td>
<td>Councillor T Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Chambers</td>
<td>Councillor Thompson (Deputy Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Cooper</td>
<td>Councillor Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Cummings</td>
<td>Councillor Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Douglas</td>
<td>Councillor Woods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Ards and North Down Borough Council was held in the Town Hall, The Castle, Bangor on Wednesday, 29 August 2018 commencing at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: The Mayor (Councillor Smart)

Aldermen: Carson Irvine
           Fletcher Keery
           Gibson Smith
           Girvan McDowell
           Graham

Councillors: Adair Hunter
           Allen Martin
           Armstrong-Cotter McAlpine
           Boyle McClean
           Brooks McLiveen
           Cathcart Menagh
           Chambers Muir
           Cooper Robinson
           Cummings Smith
           Douglas Thompson
           Dunlop Wilson
           Dunne Woods
           Edmund
           Gilmour

Officers: Chief Executive (S Reid), Director of Community and Wellbeing (G Bannister), Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning (S McCullough), Director of Environment (D Lindsay), Director of Organisational Development and Administration (W Swanston), Corporate Communications Manager (C Jackson), Democratic Services Manager (J Wilson) and Democratic Services Officer (J Glasgow)

1. PRAYER

The Mayor (Councillor Smart) welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited the Chief Executive to commence the meeting by reading the Council prayer.

NOTED.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend were received from Alderman Henry, Councillor Kennedy, Councillor Ferguson and Councillor Walker.
3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Dunlop declared an interest in Item 16 – The Soldiers’ Charity Ladies Lunch.

**NOTED.**

4. **MAYOR’S BUSINESS**

The Mayor expressed condolences to Alderman Girvan on the passing of her mother.

The Mayor was saddened to advise Members that a Council employee, Evelyn McKinley had passed away. Evelyn had previously been an employee of the legacy Ards Borough Council and the Mayor advised that he would be passing condolences to Evelyn’s family on behalf of Council.

The Mayor also advised that Councillor Ferguson had been unwell of late and he had sent the Council’s best wishes to her for a speedy recovery.

Members gave a round of applause to congratulate the Director of Organisational Development and Administration on her recent marriage.

Alderman Smith asked that the Mayor send a letter on behalf of Council to Alison and Kieran on the very successful recent Open House Festival. The festival had involved 140 events in 40 venues over 31 days, those events had been wide ranging including music, theatre, literature, film, poetry, visual art, food and drinks events. 40,000 people had attended the festival and ticket sales had increased 51% from last year. Alderman Smith was pleased to see many of the local businesses having participated and remarked on the success of many events. Last year the festival made £1.7m and the Open House Festival team hoped they could exceed that amount this year increasing the economic impact to the Borough. Alderman Smith felt the Open House Festival Team were a fantastic team and the profile of the Borough had been raised from the festival.

Proposed by Alderman Smith, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that a letter of congratulations be sent to the Open House Festival Team.

Alderman Smith advised that Councillor Cathcart would be celebrating a big milestone the next day and wished him a Happy Birthday.

The Mayor referred to the fantastic efforts of the Open House Festival and stated that he would be happy to send a letter of congratulations.

**AGREED.**
5. **MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR ENGAGEMENTS FOR THE MONTH** (Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Copy of Mayor and Deputy Mayor Engagements for the month of August 2018.

The Mayor thanked the Deputy Mayor and the relevant Chairs of Committees who had assisted him during the month.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the information be noted.

6. **MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 25 JULY 2018**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Copy of the above minutes.

Councillors Edmund and Woods advised that they had been attendance at the July Council meeting however their names did not appear in the attendance list.

*Note- Democratic Services were subsequently advised that Councillors Allen, Edmund, Cooper and Director of Organisational Development and Administration names had been omitted from the list of attendees.*

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Edmund, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the minutes, as amended, be agreed as a correct record.

7. **MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

7.1 **Holywood Town Steering Group dated 23 July 2018**  
(Appendix II)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Copy of the above minutes.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Dunne, seconded by Councillor Muir, that the minutes be agreed as a correct record.

7.2. **Holywood Town Steering Group dated 2 August 2018**  
(Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Dunne, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the minutes be agreed as a correct record.

7.3. **Planning Committee dated 7 August 2018**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Copy of the above minutes.
RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Alderman McDowell, that the minutes be agreed as a correct record.

7.4. **Special Planning Committee dated 21 August 2018**

The Mayor advised that the Special Planning Committee minutes were deferred.

8. **REQUEST FOR DEPUTATION**

8.1 **Kilcooley Women’s Centre – Peace 4 Capital Project ‘Icon’**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Correspondence from Kilcooley Women’s Centre detailing that further to recent meetings regarding the above project, which was currently at economic appraisal stage to deliver a £6.8 million investment for the Borough if successful. Kilcooley Women’s Centre detailed its request to present the vision and concept to the Council and the relevant Committee(s) in order to progress the project with the assistance and support of Council Officers and Elected Members.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the deputation be heard by the appropriate Committee.

9. **CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS**

9.1. **Department of Justice – Draft Northern Ireland Modern Slavery Strategy 2018-2019** – Comments to be submitted by 18 October 2018

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Copy consultation document.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the Consultation document be referred to the Corporate Committee.

9.2. **Department for Infrastructure – Removal of Deposits and Securities as Alternatives to Conventional Insurance** – Comments to be submitted by 2 October 2018

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Copy consultation document.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the information be noted.

9.3. **Department of Justice – Unduly Lenient Sentences** – Comments to be submitted by 2 October 2018

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Copy consultation document.

Proposed by Councillor Douglas, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the document be referred to the relevant Committee.
Councillor Cathcart felt it was important that the Council responded to the consultation. Drug and paramilitary gangs were terrorising communities and those communities did not feel the justice system was on their side or anything was being done to end the criminality of those gangs. The proposal by the Department of Justice following recommendations by the Panel would give the justice system more tools to tackle terrorism and paramilitary activity. Every time a lenient sentence was given out for the despicable crimes, it eroded public confidence in the justice system.

The proposal would allow the Director of the PPS to refer sentences which he/she felt were unduly lenient to the court of appeal. Councillor Cathcart stated that paramilitaries and terrorists had no place in society and he looked forward to the discussion on the important issue when considered at Committee.

There were many people who did not feel the justice system was working and as a Council, Councillor Cathcart felt it was important that the Council give consideration to the matter and sent out a clear message.

AGREED, that the Consultation document be referred to the relevant Committee.

10. **CONFERENCES, INVITATIONS ETC**

10.1 **NILGA/Department of Justice – Developing a Safe and a Just Community - Friday 28 September 2018 – The City Hotel, Londonderry**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Correspondence from NILGA regarding the above event.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McClean, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that the event be noted.

10.2. **National Association of Planning Enforcement (NAPE) Conference – Birmingham 3 October 2018**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that NAPE was the National Association of Planning Enforcement – overseen by the Royal Town Planning Institute. The primary purpose of the network was to promote and enhance the role of planning enforcement within the planning profession. NAPE promoted and supported local and regional activity and encouraged the sharing of good practice. It was launched in June 2006 and had been involved in a significant number of consultations, projects and events.

That was the only planning conference delivered annually which was specifically related to planning enforcement and it provided a massive opportunity to develop professional relationships and expand professional knowledge.

The cost of the conference was free to members of NAPE and the only expense would be the return flight and accommodation. The flights were costed currently at £98 return per person. Accommodation would be required for the previous night to
enable registration the morning of the conference and was costed at approximately £185 per person.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves the attendance of two members of the Planning Department’s Enforcement section at the annual NAPE conference to garner professional experience of various topics at the forefront of planning enforcement and specific case law updates and workshops. Costs of flights and accommodation in the region of £285 per person to be met from existing Planning training budgets.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the recommendation be adopted.

10.3. MIPIM UK – The UK Property Marketplace Conference Olympia, London 17-18 October 2018

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that the MIPIM UK was the UK’s largest and most insightful property event for professionals providing the most comprehensive conference programme in the real estate industry. It was the leading property summit for all key stakeholders in UK real estate to connect and do business. In its 5th year, MIPIM UK would focus on the era of unprecedented social, economic and political change. The 2-day event would provide an essential discussion and networking platform for the very best in UK property to debate the big issues in real estate and to shape the future of the industry.

A key action from the ITDRS was to develop an Internationalisation Strategy for the Borough particularly in relation to the attraction of new investment/companies into the area. MIPIM UK may provide a key platform in that regard and therefore Council Officer attendance was recommended to review the Conference and establish key contacts.

The cost of the conference for Public Authority representatives was £299 each and return flights to Heathrow were approximately £106 each. It was proposed that attendance was for one day and therefore no accommodation costs would be incurred.

The format was a mixture of keynote speakers discussing topics relevant to property investment and regeneration in the UK, supplemented by workshops and panel sessions. Over 3,000 delegates had the opportunity to network and set up business meetings including with potential investors. There would be the opportunity to meet with urban planners, developers and investors and strengthen partnerships via the conferences at MIPIM UK. A report would be brought back for the Committee to consider.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves the attendance of the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning and the Head of Economic Development at the MIPIM UK Conference in London on 17 October 2018. Costs to be met from existing budgets.
RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the recommendation be adopted.

11. ITEM WITHDRAWN

12. ARDS AND NORTH DOWN SPORTS FORUM – FILE REF: SD109

(Appendices IV - V)

(Councillor Muir declared an interest in the item and withdrew from the meeting – 7.19 pm)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Community and Wellbeing attaching Sports Forum Applications for Noting and Approving August 2018 and Unsuccessful Sports Forum Grants August 2018. The report detailed that Members would be aware that on the 26th August 2015 Council delegated authority to the Ards and North Down Sports Forum Borough, in order to allow it to administer sports grants funding on behalf of the Council. £25,000 had been allocated within the 2018/2019 revenue budget for the purpose.

The Council further authorised the Forum under delegated powers to award grants of up to £250. Grants above £250 still required Council approval. In addition, the Council requested that regular updates were reported to members.

During August 2018, the Forum received a total of 36 grant applications; 28 of which were for Travel and Accommodation, 2 of which were for Equipment, 2 of which were for Events, 1 of which was for Coaching, 1 of which was for Seeding, 1 of which was a Discretionary award and we also had 2 Gold Card Applications.

A total of 2 of the applications failed to meet the specified criteria. The reasons for the unsuccessful applications were detailed on the Appendix.

For information, the annual budget and spend to date on grant categories was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2018</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Funding Awarded August 2018</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Accommodation*</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td>£2,390</td>
<td>£4,107.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching*</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£1,341.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment *</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£1,301.34</td>
<td>-£525.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events*</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td>£688</td>
<td>-£1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeding*</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gold Cards Issued during the period August 2018 was 2.

* The proposed remaining budget for Travel & Accommodation of £4,107.83 is based on a proposed award of £2,390 with reclaimed costs of £7.03 and withdrawn costs of
£100 as listed in Appendix 1(A). The proposed remaining budget for Coaching of £1,394.25 is based on a proposed award of £150 with withdrawn costs of £101.25 as listed in Appendix 1(C). The proposed remaining budget for Equipment of £525.85 is based on a proposed award of £1301.34 as listed in Appendix 1(B). The proposed remaining budget for Events of £688 is based on a proposed award of £1950 as listed in Appendix 1(D). The proposed remaining budget for Seeding of £250 is based on a proposed award of £250 as listed in Appendix 1(E). The proposed remaining budget for Discretionary of £880 is based on a proposed award of £120 as listed in Appendix 1(F).

RECOMMENDED that Council approves the applications for financial assistance for sporting purposes valued at above £250, and that the applications approved by the forum (valued at below £250) are noted.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Menagh, seconded by Councillor Thompson, that the recommendation be adopted.

(Councillor Muir returned to the meeting – 7.19 pm)

13. SPORTS DEVELOPMENT CAPITAL GRANTS – FILE REF: SD114
(Appendix VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Community and Wellbeing attaching recommendations of the assessment panel. The report detailed that the Sports Development Capital Scheme was available to sports clubs within the Borough. As members would be aware the Council had set aside £50,000 for the 2018/2019 financial year and could award up to 50% of eligible capital costs with a maximum award of £5,000 in respect of any one project. Capital expenditure was defined as ‘expenditure for technical assistance and/or purchase, improvement, restoration and construction of an asset related to the applicant organisation’.

The programme was open from Monday 28th May 2018 – Wednesday 27th June 2018. The Council received 3 applications requesting a total of £10,000.

An initial screening of the applications was carried out by the Sports Development Officer. Applicants who met the essential criteria were then assessed against the following criteria:

1. Demonstrate the benefits to the club/organisation and the local community.
2. Demonstrate anticipated outcomes of the project.
3. Increase participation numbers within the club.
4. Targeting priority groups (women, disability, over 50’s and socially disadvantaged areas/groups).
5. Improving and sustaining activities within the club.
6. Improving the health and wellbeing of individuals/ communities.

Applicants were required to demonstrate how their projects met at least three of the criteria listed above. Applications were assessed by the Sports Development Officer, Assistant Sports Development officer and the Leisure Services Manager.
The second tranche of funding would be available from Monday 17th September 2018 – Wednesday 17th October 2018. The funds that were available subject to approval of Tranche 1 funding would be in Tranche 2 was £45,000

RECOMMENDED that the Council approves the recommendations of the assessment panel.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Menagh, seconded by Councillor Robinson, that the recommendation be adopted.

14. WAR MEMORIAL REFURBISHMENT PROGRAMME - COMMEMORATIVE BENCHES– FILE REF:65324/65377 (Appendix VII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Environment attaching Analysis of Risk Factors Affecting the Proposed WW1 Memorial Seat. The report detailed that Members would be aware that the Centenary of WW1 would be commemorated in 2018 and recall several previous reports on proposals for refurbishment/minor improvement works at each of our war memorials to mark the occasion.

The scope of the project agreed in December 2017 and works had been progressing according to plan, however a number of decisions remain to be made regarding the commemorative benches included within the project.

1.0 Backing Plates

In May Officers presented the Environment Committee with some potential hazards arising from the chosen design of bench. Members agreed that officers come back with a report providing further detail on the risks. Those were detailed within the appendix.

It was also requested at this meeting that members be presented with a number of options for backing plates of different colours and materials to enable an informed decision to be made. Those options were presented within the recommendation section of the report.

2.0 Commemorative Bench Plaques

At the meeting in December Council agreed that a plaque remembering the fallen be fitted to each bench, with wording such as:

“This bench is placed here by Ards and North Down Borough Council to remind us all of the sacrifice provided by many in the causes of freedom and democracy.”

Members agreed that should be passed to the RBL for their comments. The RBL subsequently came back with:
“This bench is placed here by Ards and North Down Borough Council in remembrance of the sacrifice paid by the citizens of the Borough during two world wars and conflicts since.

We will remember them.”

RECOMMENDED:-

1. That the Council approve one of the following options for the commemorative benches:
   a. No backing plate
   b. Powder coated white backing plate
   c. Stainless steel backing plate
   d. Perspex backing plate
   e. Toughened glass backing plate

2. That members agree on the inscription to be added to the commemorative benches, choosing between:
   a. The original proposal previously suggested, and
   b. The amended proposal received from RBL.

The Mayor requested that the first element of the recommendation be taken first.

Recommendation 1

Proposed by Councillor Cummings, seconded by Councillor Edmund, that the Council approve option 1b - Powder coated white backing plate for the commemorative benches.

Proposed by Councillor Martin, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, as an amendment, that the Council approve a powder coated white backing plate and a perspex front for the commemorative benches (recommendation 1).

Alderman Keery expressed concerns that a young person would become caught at the back. Following clarification, Alderman Keery was content as long as a child could not become caught.

Councillor Woods was of the understanding that the matter would have been referred back to the Environment Committee for further consideration. Councillor Woods asked if the amendment could be undertaken. In response the Director of Environment confirmed that the proposal could be met however, noted that would increase the cost of each seat.

Councillor McIlveen rose in support of the amendment, he was of the understanding that the benches would have a front cover and thought that would have been a logical approach.

Councillor Adair also rose in support of the amendment, he stressed the importance of the Council doing it right as it was an important milestone in the nation’s history to remember those brave men who laid down their lives in the great war.
Recommendation 2

In respect of recommendation 2, Councillor Martin wished to put forward an alternative proposal which he considered to be an amalgamation of both the options presented.

Proposed by Councillor Martin, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, as an amendment, ‘This bench is placed here by Ards and North Down Borough Council in remembrance of the sacrifice paid by citizens of this Borough during two world wars and subsequent conflicts for the protection of our freedom and democracy. ‘We will remember them’

Councillor Martin stated that he was thrilled that progress was being made on the matter which was a result of a notice of motion that he had submitted. He was also pleased that the benches would be in situ in time for the commemorations. He felt remembrance was an important concept for educational purposes. Councillor Martin stated that people needed reminded that freedom was not freedom at no cost, it was at a high cost, many soldiers did not come back from the wars. Councillor Martin felt the benches would serve as an adequate, timely appropriate remembrance and would encourage the younger generation to think of the sacrifices that had been made on their behalf.

Councillor Muir noted that the specification for the plaque was a limit of 25 words. He understood the rationale behind the amendment and importance to show respect for the sacrifice given however highlighted that the Royal British Legion had been consulted and the wording proposed within the report had been their recommendation and he personally felt that their feedback should be respected.

(Councillor Adair withdrew from the meeting – 7.28 pm)

Alderman Girvan agreed with Councillor Muir, the plaque was to commemorate and remember the sacrifice and she was concerned with the increasing number of words. She felt it was important that at the end the words ‘we will remember them’ appeared on the plaque as that was the purpose of the benches.

(Councillor Adair re-entered the meeting – 7.29 pm)

The Mayor sought clarity on the word limit. The Director of Environment was not aware of the limit and he thought it would be a case that the plaque would need to be appropriately sized for the length of inscription.

Councillor Woods referred to the memorial bench policy which detailed that the plaque should be no greater than 100mm x 50mm in size with approved with the subscription being no greater than 25 words. Furthermore, it should not be continuous in nature and create community unrest.

Councillor Martin stated that the benches were distinct, and a variation from the policy could occur for the one off act of remembrance. In terms of the wording he had not taken anything out, he respected the views of the Royal British Legion and
therefore had suggested an amalgamation of the two proposals. He agreed that it was important to include ‘we will remember them’.

Councillor McIlveen noted that the policy which Councillor Woods was referring to was the memorial bench policy for individuals who wished to purchase a bench in memory of their loved ones rather that this situation.

In terms of the policy, the Mayor questioned that if the plaques would be created in a separate process to the benches and if more time could be taken to give consideration to the policy and wording.

The Director of Environment stated that the most pressing matter was to gain agreement for the benches. There was more time for the plaque to be considered in line with the policy to confirm the details. The installation of the benches could proceed without delay and the plaques could be applied thereafter.

RESOLVED, that Council proceed with recommendation 1, as amended, and refer recommendation 2 back to the Environment Committee.

15. NORTHERN IRELAND FITNESS AWARDS – FILE REF:CW63

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Community and Wellbeing detailing that the Council had been shortlisted for ‘Best Corporate Wellness Programme’ at this year’s NI Fitness Awards. The submission for the award contained details of the work carried out by the Council’s Employee Health and Wellbeing Group.

The winner would be announced at a black-tie award ceremony being held on Saturday 22nd September 2018 in the Crowne Plaza, Belfast at 6.30pm.

It was proposed that the Council send the Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Committee, or their representative, along with an officer from the Environmental Health, Protection and Development Service. The cost was £85 per person, that could be met from within this year’s budget.

RECOMMENDED that the Council agrees that two representatives from the Council attend the NI Fitness Award ceremony on 22nd September 2018.

Proposed by Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that Councillor Allen attends the ceremony.

Proposed by Alderman Smith, seconded by Alderman Carson, that The Mayor, Councillor Smart, attends the ceremony.

RESOLVED, that the recommendation be adopted and that The Mayor and Councillor Allen attend the NI Fitness Award Ceremony on 22 September 2018.
16. **THE SOLDIERS’ CHARITY LADIES LUNCH – FILE REF:DIS**  
(Appendix VIII)

(Having previously declared an interest in the item, Councillor Dunlop withdrew from the meeting – 7.34 pm)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration attaching letter had been received inviting female councillors and officers to the Soldiers’ Charity Annual Ladies Lunch.

The event takes place on Tuesday 11 September 2018 in the Royal Belfast Golf Club and tickets cost £20 per person with all proceeds going to support soldiers, veterans and army families.

RECOMMENDED that the Council considers the invitations to the Soldiers’ Charity Ladies Lunch.

Alderman Graham recalled previous similar invitations that the Council had received and Members could attend if they wished. He suggested that the Mayor or Deputy Mayor attend.

The Mayor advised that unfortunately he had a prior engagement on that date but advised that the Deputy Mayor was available.

Proposed by Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Thompson attends.

Alderman Smith also suggested that Councillor Dunlop attends. She noted that she would also be attending but covering the cost of the ticket herself.

**RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the recommendation be adopted and that the Deputy Mayor and Councillor Dunlop attend the Soldiers’ Charity Ladies Lunch.**

(Councillor Dunlop re-entered the meeting – 7.36pm)

17. **ENGAGEMENT WITH THE DEAF COMMUNITY IN THE ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL AREA – FILE REF:DIS**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration detailing that Ards and North Down Borough Council had a large population of deaf and hearing-impaired residents. Those individuals and their families had the same rights to access services as any other ratepayers and residents. In June 2018 two Elected Members met representatives of the community at the British Deaf Association premises, learned of the issues which represented a barrier to accessing services and subsequently discussed them with the Council’s Compliance Officer (Equality and Safeguarding).
As a result the following engagement activities had been arranged:-

- Further to the approved Notice of Motion, Deaf and hearing-impaired residents have been invited to attend the public gallery to experience the full Council meeting on Wednesday 26 September at 7.00pm. Two BSL signers had been invited to ensure those present were able to follow the proceedings. On the evening, Elected Members and officers would be asked to speak clearly to enable the signers to engage those in the public gallery. The position of the signers would be agreed in advance to take account of the layout of the Council Chamber. Speakers should address comments to the Mayor, as normal. The signers and visitors would leave by 8.30pm on the evening, or before that if the public meeting concluded earlier.

- A ‘Meet your Councillor’ Event had been arranged for Wednesday 17 October 2018 commencing with an informal cup of tea at 6.15 pm, a talk on the history of the Town Hall at 6.45 pm and then a presentation on the services provided by the Council, followed by an opportunity to put questions and concerns to the Elected Members present. It was hoped there would be a large attendance of Elected Members to maximise the benefit of the engagement opportunity. The Community Planning Manager would be present to give a brief presentation on the Community Plan and to highlight the value of the input from the audience. Again, two BSL signers would be present to facilitate this event.

- As some of the issues that would be raised may require consideration or Council officer follow up, a further session of a similar format had been arranged for Wednesday 21 November commencing at 6.15pm to ensure the engagement was meaningful and responses were given to all issues raised.

- Publicity and invitations to the above events had been issued through the British Deaf Association (BDA), for circulation via the BDA Facebook page, Twitter and BSL/ISL Vlog.

Arrangements with BDA were free and the charge of the freelance BSL signers would be covered from the Equality budget. However, the Council would be charged for all future engagement with and support from the BDA.

RECOMMENDED that the report is noted and Elected Members make best efforts to attend the engagement sessions in October and November.

Proposed by Councillor Woods, seconded by Councillor Robinson, as an amendment, that the recommendation be adopted and that Officers reach out and contact the Irish Sign Language Association to see if there are Irish Sign Language users within the Borough who may be interested in coming to the sign language events, requiring a sign language interpreter.

Councillor Robinson spoke in support of the amendment in the interests of inclusivity and respect for all cultures within the Borough.

AGREED.
PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration attaching letter from NI Strategic Migration Partnership, (NISMP), seeking an Officer and an Elected Member to sit on a cross-council Sustainable Communities and Demographics Working Group.

NISMP was a regional body, hosted by NILGA, which provided an advisory and coordinating role in relation to migration in Northern Ireland. Councils were represented on the board through 5 elected members on a cross-party basis and the board also comprises senior representation from NI Departments, key non-governmental organisations and the Home Office.

The Sustainable Communities and Demographics Working Group would be instrumental in identifying and addressing council needs and concerns relating to changing demographics and ensuring that those were understood by decision makers at both Westminster and Stormont.

In the first instance, it was proposed that a primary focus for the group would be to determine the impact of migration on the economic and social priorities for each council. The group would also act as a forum for sharing of good practice among members on issues such as hate crime, support services and social cohesion.

The group would comprise both officers and elected members. Ideally nominees would have a strategic understanding of the council’s economic and social priorities, be an effective communicator within the council and had an interest in the themes under discussion.

Further information about NISMP and the terms of reference of the Sustainable Communities and Demographics working group could be obtained from the NISMP secretariat at NILGA, who would be happy to either meet face to face or chat by phone.

The Head of Community and Culture, Jan Nixey, would be the Officer nominated and the Council should consider nominating an Elected Member to the Group.

RECOMMENDED that Council nominates one Elected Member onto the NISMP’s Sustainable Communities and Demographics Working Group.

Proposed by Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that Councillor T Smith be nominated onto the NISMP’s Sustainable Communities and Demographics Working Group.
Proposed by Councillor Woods, seconded by Councillor Robinson, that Councillor Hunter, be nominated onto the NISMP's Sustainable Communities and Demographics Working Group.

As there were two nominations for one place, a vote was undertaken with a show of hands. The voting resulted as follows:

Councillor T Smith – 24 FOR
Councillor Hunter – 5 FOR

RESOLVED, that Councillor T Smith be nominated onto the NISMP’s Sustainable Communities and Demographics Working Group.

19. SEALING DOCUMENTS

RESOLVED: - (On the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Councillor McIlveen)

THAT the Seal of the Council be affixed to the following documents:-

a) Invest NI Letter of Offer
b) Sale of Land at 15 Dermott Gardens, Comber
c) Sale of Land at 11 Dermott Gardens, Comber
d) Sale of Land at 13 Dermott Gardens, Comber
e) Grant of Rights of Burial Nos: 12789-12801
f) Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing & Leisure Complex – Acheson & Glover – Warranty – Subcontractor’s Collateral Warranty
g) Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing & Leisure Complex – Walter Watson Ltd – Subcontractor’s Collateral Warranty

AGREED.

20. TRANSFER OF RIGHTS OF BURIAL

The following transfer application was received:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transferred to</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr William Rowan</td>
<td>Miss Wendy Rowan</td>
<td>Clandeboye</td>
<td>PX6193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOLVED: - (On the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Gibson)

THAT the above Transfer be approved.
21. **NOTICES OF MOTION STATUS REPORT**
   (Appendix X)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Report from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration attaching a Status Report in respect of Notices of Motion.

That was a standing item on the Council agenda each month and its aim was to keep members updated on the outcome of motions. As each motion was dealt with it would be removed from the report.

**RECOMMENDED** that the report be noted.

**RESOLVED** on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Gibson, that the recommendation be adopted.

22. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

22.1 **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor McIlveen**

That this Council explores with the Historic Environment Division of the Department for Communities ways in which this Council can facilitate the opening of The Priory in Newtownards during peak tourist periods.

Councillor Menagh advised that he had raised the matter without success during legacy Ards Borough Council. He hoped this time progress could be made.

**RESOLVED**, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Regeneration and Development Committee.

22.2 **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor McIlveen**

That this Council erects appropriate signage at Movilla cemetery, in consultation with the family of Blair Mayne, to indicate the location of the final resting place of Lieutenant-Colonel Blair Mayne.

And furthermore, writes to Historic Environment Division requesting that all necessary steps are taken in order that the hoardings are removed from the area where the Blair Mayne family plot is located.

**RESOLVED**, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Community and Wellbeing Committee.

22.3 **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor McIlveen**

That this Council being mindful of its responsibilities under the Disability Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 2005 adopts a policy to prevent those who
do not display a disability blue badge from using disabled parking spaces in Londonderry Park and provides a sufficient resource to enforce this policy.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Environment Committee.

22.4 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cooper

In light of the substantial obvious increase in the population of Comber as a result of new building developments, officers urgently investigate introducing a one way system from Mill street and Castle street towards the square as quickly as possible, to alleviate the existing (and future worsening), traffic congestion, and bring back a report as to how to proceed and facilitate this provision forthwith.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cooper, seconded by Councillor Menagh, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Regeneration and Development Committee.

22.5. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Douglas and Councillor Muir

This Council notes that 2018 marked the twenty-third anniversary of the Srebrenica genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which saw over 8,000 Muslim men and boys killed in a matter of days; notes that in 2009 the European Parliament passed a resolution that 11th July should be recognised as the day of commemoration of the Srebrenica genocide all over the EU; and in 2015 urged the development of educational and cultural programmes that promote an understanding of the causes of such atrocities and raise awareness about the need to nurture peace and to promote human rights and inter-faith tolerance. All Northern Ireland political parties have supported the work of Remembering Srebrenica in this regard; applauds the work of those involved in the pursuit of justice for the victims and their surviving relatives, including the International Commission of Missing People (ICMP) and the Mothers of Srebrenica, whose courage and humility in the face of unthinkable horror is an inspiration to us all; commends the work of the charity, Remembering Srebrenica, in raising awareness of this tragic and preventable genocide and working in communities across the UK and Ireland to help them learn the lessons of Srebrenica; and brings back a report on possible events or activities to commemorate the anniversary and build understanding.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Douglas, seconded by Councillor Muir, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Committee.

Councillor Muir highlighted the number of motions that were for referral to the Corporate Services Committee. The Mayor highlighted that Members submitted the motions and he encouraged Members to keep motions relevant to Council business.

22.6. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Walker
That this Council acknowledges the result of the EU Referendum of June 2016 but asserts that no one in Ards and North Down Borough voted for a bad deal or no deal that could wreck our economy and jeopardise our peace process. We therefore write to the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister expressing our support for the growing demand for a People’s Vote on the final Brexit deal.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Douglas, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Committee.

22.7. Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman Henry and Councillors Robinson & T Smith

That this Council undertakes to write to the other ten Councils requesting support in lobbying central government in relation to financial cuts introduced since 2015 in the provision of community transport for individuals isolated due to physical and mental health needs, rural location and those who are vulnerable due to personal circumstances and identifies the urgency to deal with as these individuals are very limited in opportunities to engage with others. A request will be made to meet the Secretary of State along with service users to highlight the range of concerns. It also calls upon the officers to bring back a report detailing the current service provision and the known effect of the service reductions across the Borough.

Given the urgency surrounding the matter, the Mayor agreed for the motion to be heard.

Councillor Smith advised that he had attended the June meeting of the Disability Forum while a range of issues had been discussed there had been great concern and anger expressed regarding the cuts on community transport. Recent press coverage had shown the impact that the ongoing cuts was having on the users, highlighting that the users were some of the most vulnerable people in society.

(Councillor Muir and Councillor Douglas withdrew from the meeting – 7.44 pm)

Continuing, Councillor Smith further highlighted that the cuts were ongoing and there had been significant cuts to the services since 2015. The transport services were used by many elderly people who had mobility problems and also those with a wide range of disabilities both physical and mental. There were a great number of residents that relied on the service as the only means of contact outside their homes, the service allowed people to engage socially with their friends, go shopping, access leisure facilities and attend hospital/doctor appointments. Those were day to day activities that many took for granted however for those with physical and or mental health problems those activities could be difficult and stressful. There were many issues that needed addressed, the hours of operation were extremely limited, users of the service had to make sure they were home by 6 pm on a weekday and the hours of operation at the weekend were so limited that for many the service provided no use.

(Councillor Martin withdrew from the meeting – 7.46 pm)
Councillor Smith stated that there were many residents living with what he described as a virtual curfew, trapped in their homes every evening and weekend. He felt that Council needed to take action to ensure those affected were not forced to endure such circumstance. Because someone had a physical or mental health need, should not mean that they could not enjoy an evening out with friends or have to spend a weekend trapped within their homes and forced to endure loneliness.

(Councillor Douglas re-entered the meeting – 7.47 pm)

Councillor Smith stated that the motion also called for a meeting with the Secretary of State, that meeting was for the users to tell the Secretary of State the real impact the cuts were having on their lives.

(Councillor Martin re-entered the meeting – 7.48 pm)

Councillor Robinson concurred with the comments that the transport scheme was vital to many within Borough. The users were having to rely on expensive taxi fares for small trips which impacted on people’s ability to socialise. Social isolation was a big problem across province and there was a need to support people back into the community. Councillor Robinson stated that the transport scheme was vital and hoped that with the support of the Council, that action could be taken to ensure that those people that were vulnerable were not side lined. In finishing she encouraged all Members to support the motion for those that needed the Council’s help.

The Mayor wished to put on record his thanks to Shirley Poxon, Compliance Officer for the work she undertook to ensure inclusivity within the Borough.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Robinson, that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

22.8. Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman Smith and Councillor McClean

The Council own the allotments situated at Bryansburn Road. These have been allowed to become a little more than a wilderness. There are approximately 20 good sized allotments with only 5 being used with I understand a waiting list.

This Notice of Motion is seeking a full report as to why the allotments have been allowed to become little more than a wasteland and importantly as well what is their future.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Community and Wellbeing Committee.

22.9. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cummings

That this Council supports the introduction of Finns Law which seeks to amend the Animal Welfare Act 2006 to include a specific crime of injury to police dogs and horse, and writes to local MPs to support the bill and advocate for its legislative adoption in Northern Ireland.
RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cummings, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Environment Committee.

(Councillor Muir re-entered the meeting – 7.50 pm)

22.10. Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman M Smith & Alderman W Irvine

The railings at the roundabout at the top of Main Street at the post office in Bangor, were once a colourful welcome of beautiful rail hanging baskets. Now it is simply a blank dreary and barren area. There is a considerable difference in the number of rail planters between Newtownards town centre approach, roughly over 90 rail planters to that of Bangor which is nil. Following many complaints regarding this situation, I would ask for a full report as to why this is happening and how the approach into Bangor can be restored to something which was once something to be proud of.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Community and Wellbeing Committee.

22.11. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor T Smith & Councillor Kennedy

This Council condemns SF/IRA’s ongoing celebration and veneration of terrorists who engaged in a bloody sectarian campaign which saw thousands murdered and many more maimed and injured. This Council believes that such commemoration events are hate crimes and provide nothing more than an opportunity for those who still despise those who are British, Protestant and Unionist to revel in the slaughter of innocent people. We call on the Secretary of State to take act to ban these gruesome and vile events which have no part in any civilised society.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor T Smith, seconded by Councillor Edmund, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Committee.

22.12. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Martin and Councillor Dunne

This Council asks for an update report to be brought forward on the redevelopment of Grey Point Fort in Helens Bay with due regards to current funding streams, overall timescales and milestones on this project. This is an important military landmark in our Borough and is currently in need of a considerable amount of refurbishment. Council also requests an informal meeting between Senior Officers, stakeholders and local military historians to update them and discuss future plans for the site

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Martin, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Regeneration and Development Committee.
22.13. **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor C Kennedy**

That this Council bring back a report regarding the erection of a memorial to the eight people who were killed on Church Street during the 1936 Ards TT Race; which ultimately lead to the cancelling of the event; and that this memorial might be placed on the western end of the wall at Ards Hospital on Church Street.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor T Smith, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Committee.

22.14. **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor C Kennedy**

That this Council creates a Committee to consider the manner in which Ards and North Down Borough Council will mark the 100th Anniversary of Northern Ireland in 2021 and to draw up a schedule of appropriate events etc. through which to mark our 100th Birthday.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor T Smith, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Committee.

22.15. **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor C Kennedy**

That this Council agrees that criminal gangs are taking advantage of the NI Housing Executive transfer scheme, using it as a direct means to geographically extend their drugs empires; that is having a hugely detrimental impact upon established communities across the Borough; that it is having the effect of fracturing local families and their ability to live close to one another and that measures be taken both to put an end to this abuse and to give families who have establish ties with a particular area with priority when accommodation is being allocated.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor T Smith, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Committee.

22.16. **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor C Kennedy**

That this Council takes the advice of the Chief Executive of Tourism NI. John McGrillen, that we should be pursuing the “Culturally Curious” tourism product and reinstates the Ulster-Scots greeting of “Fair Faa Ye” to entrance signs to the Borough, which were removed without consultation upon the amalgamation of Ards Borough Council and North Down Borough Council; acknowledges all relevant requirements under Equality legislation have already been fulfilled; and that the message “Haste Ye Baak” be placed on each sign upon leaving the Borough.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor T Smith, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Committee.
22.17. **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor E Thompson**

That Council officers bring back a report with costs regarding the extension in 2019, of the Sunday Musical Concerts, currently being held in Ward Park to other venues across the Borough including the Ards Peninsula Villages.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Thompson, seconded by Councillor Edmund, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Regeneration and Development Committee.

**EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED, on the proposal of Councillor Martin, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that the public/press be excluded from the meeting for the undernoted items of confidential business.

23. **KILCOOLEY WOMEN’S CENTRE ICON CENTRE – FILE REF:CDV30B**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

24. **RETROSPECTIVE APPROVAL FOR SINGLE ACTION TENDER, GROUNDWORKS NI– FILE REF: GREL 415**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

25. **TENDER – IMPROVEMENT WORKS TO BALLYWALTER HARBOUR – FILE REF:65379**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).
26. **TENDER FOR THE PROVISION OF COUNCIL SIGNAGE – FILE REF:CCPS0916**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

27. **EXTENSION OF TENDER FOR THE PROVISION OF EVENT SUPPORT SERVICES – FILE REF:CCPS0916**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

28. **REQUEST TO ALTER A RIGHT OF WAY AT CHURCH STREET, GREYABBHEY – FILE REF:LP319**

(Appendix XI)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

29. **BELFAST CITY REGION DEAL – FILE REF:RDP22**

(Appendices XII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).
30. **D1 FORM – SALE OF LEASEHOLD INTEREST IN 1-2 REDBURN SQUARE, HOLYWOOD – FILE REF: LP41**
   (Appendices XIII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

31. **NAMING OF A ROOM IN THE ARDS BLAIR MAYNE WELLBEING AND LEISURE CENTRE AFTER DUSTY MILLAR – FILE REF: CW109**
   (Appendices XIV, XV, XVI)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

32. **REQUEST FOR THE USE OF WARD ARRAS PARK FOR MAJOR EVENT – FILE REF: 141656**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

33. **BRAND IDENTITY FOR ARDS BLAIR MAYNE WELLBEING AND LEISURE COMPLEX**
   (Appendix XVII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

**RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED, on the proposal of Councillor McClean, seconded by Councillor Douglas, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.
Members were advised that in line with Section 47 (1) of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 the audio recording would now recommence.

**Circulated for Information**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Undernoted items of correspondence.

(a) Advice NI Blue Print for Improving Universal Credit
(b) Education Authority – Bangor Central Integrated Primary School
(c) Department of Health – Perinatal Hospice Facility Service for Northern Ireland Department for Communities – Waiving of the Fees for Burials and Cremations of Children under 18 years of age
(d) NILGA Bulletin August 2018
(e) Post Office – Changes to Service at Donaghadee Correspondence from the Department for Infrastructure – Phasing of Traffic Signals at the Square, Comber

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the correspondence be noted.

Councillor T Smith asked that the correspondence that had been received in response to Notice of Motions be referred to the relevant Committee. The Chief Executive advised that would occur as a standard approach.

**TERMINATION OF MEETING**

The meeting terminated at 8.06 pm.
ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A special meeting of the Planning Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Tuesday, 21 August 2018 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor Cathcart

Aldermen: Carson Henry
Fletcher Keery
Graham McDowell
Gibson

Councillors: Dunne Thompson
McIlveen (7.09pm)

Officers: Chief Executive (S Reid), Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning (S McCullough), Head of Planning (A McCullough), Principal Planning and Technical Officer (L Maginn) and Democratic Services Officers (M McElveen and E Brown)

Also in Attendance: Chris Bryson – Strategic Planning

WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed members and officers to the meeting.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend were received from Alderman Girvan, Councillor Hunter and Councillor Walker. An apology for lateness was received from Councillor McIlveen.

NOTED.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman, Councillor Cathcart, sought any Declarations of Interest at this stage.

No Declarations were made.

NOTED.
3. REQUEST FOR SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR LDP

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 7 August 2018 from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning referring to the timetabling for the production of the Local Development Plan (LDP) and that the Council had agreed to call special meetings of the Planning Committee to progress this as follows:

- 21 August 2018
- 17 October 2018
- 21 November 2018

Due to the need to finalise draft options to enable Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) scoring it was necessary, in order to attempt to finalise in line with the timetable, to hold an additional Special Planning Committee on 18 September at 7.00 pm.

The Council had previously approved the Terms of Reference for the LDP Steering Group. The primary role of the Steering Group was to oversee the Governance in relation to the development of the LDP. It was originally recommended that this group, made up of Planning Committee Members, would meet quarterly before Planning Committees, with the next meeting scheduled for 4 September 2018. However, in light of the scheduled additional Planning Committee meeting it was recommended that the LDP Steering Group became a regular item (quarterly) on the Planning Committee agenda with this to be added to the LDP Special Planning Committee on 18 September 2018.

RECOMMENDED that the Council approves the meeting on 18 September 2018 including adding the LDP Steering Group to the agenda.

The Director advised that the proposed date of 18 September 2018 conflicted with a civic event and therefore the alternative date of 20 September 2018 was now being proposed.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the recommendation to hold the meeting on 20 September 2018 be adopted.

EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the public/press be excluded from the meeting for the undernoted item of confidential business.

4. EMPLOYMENT LAND REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE AND METHODOLOGY
   (Appendix I)

*** IN CONFIDENCE ***
5. **APPROACH TO PREFERRED OPTIONS PAPER**  
(Appendix II)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

6. **HOUSING GROWTH STRATEGY – APPROACH TO OPTIONS**  
(Appendix III)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

TERMINATION OF MEETING

The meeting terminated at 9.04 pm.
ITEM 7.2.

ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Planning Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Tuesday, 4 September 2018 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor Cathcart

Aldermen: Carson Keery
          Fletcher McDowell
          Gibson Girvan
          Graham

Councillors: Dunne McIlveen
            Hunter Thompson
            McClean Walker

Officers: Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning (S McCullough), Head of Planning (A McCullough), Senior Professional and Technical Officers (A Todd and P Kerr) and Democratic Services Officers (H Loebnau and M McElveen)

Also in Attendance: Andy Stephens, David Donaldson, Dr Robin Wilson, Ryan McBirney, Andrew Dadley and Jim Millar.

WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Members and officers to the meeting and made a special mention of those persons with speaking rights and members of the public seated in the public gallery.

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for inability to attend was received from Alderman Henry.

NOTED.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman, Councillor Cathcart, sought any Declarations of Interest at this stage.

Councillor McIlveen declared an interest in Item 4.9 – LA06/2018/0228/F – Land Opposite 47 Harbour Road, Portavogie.

NOTED.
3. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 7 AUGUST 2018

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:– Copy of the above minutes.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that the minutes be noted.

4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

4.1. LA06/2017/0582/F – 63 Brunswick Road, Bangor

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:– Copy documentation (Appendix I)

DEA: Bangor West

Committee Interest: Application called in by Alderman Graham: ‘The proposed extension will unduly impact on neighbour by way of loss of privacy/light or by over dominance (A27) and whether the height of the proposed extensions will result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of daylight to neighbouring property (A29)’

Proposal: Conversion of dwelling to 2 no apartments, 2 storey rear extension, 2 ½ storey new access side extension and associated site works

Site Location: 63 Brunswick Road, Bangor

Recommendation: Approval

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer informed Members that the application sought full planning permission for the conversion of a dwelling to 2 apartments including a two storey rear extension and a two and a half storey new access side extension at 63 Brunswick Road, Bangor. The application had been brought before Planning Committee for consideration following a call-in request by Alderman Graham who had raised concerns that the extension would unduly impact on the neighbouring property by way of loss of privacy, light and over dominance.

She further advised that the site was within an established residential area in Bangor West. Planning permission was previously granted on this site for the development under consideration however that permission expired in April 2013. Since the expiry of the previous permission, the context of the site had changed with the redevelopment of the adjacent plot at 65 Brunswick Road. Planning permission was granted for redevelopment of this site in April 2014 which allowed for the demolition of the original dwelling and the erection of two new 2 ½ storey dwellings. The main issue for consideration in the current application was to assess the impact of the proposal on the new dwellings, particularly the dwelling at 65a which was closest to the proposed development.

In terms of objections, the Senior Professional and Technical Officer confirmed that 2 letters of objection had been received from the occupant of 65a. The concerns raised included:

- Loss of light to rooms situated on the eastern gable of 65a and overbearing impact
- Inadequate room to allow maintenance
• Overlooking from 2 first floor windows on proposed rear extension

The new side extension would be 0.8m from the party boundary with 65a allowing access through to the rear of the site and room for maintenance. There would be no overlooking from the first floor windows to the new rear extension as those would be subject to a condition requiring obscure glazing to be fitted prior to occupation and to be permanently retained thereafter. She further explained that the new side extension would be situated 1.9m from the gable of 65a but would only be immediately opposite the front section of its gable. No. 65a had 3 windows on its eastern elevation facing No. 63. The potential loss of light to those windows was carefully considered by the case officer. Taking each in turn, at ground floor, there was a narrow high level window to the open plan kitchen/living dining area of 65a. That was a secondary window to this internal space with three other larger windows and patio doors to the rear of the property which faced south and were the main sources of light. The new side extension to 63 would not be positioned directly opposite this window.

At first floor, No 65a had a small dressing room window. Whilst the new side extension would be positioned immediately opposite that window, it was not considered that there would be any unacceptable loss of light as that was also a secondary window with the main source of light to the room gained via the main bedroom window on the rear south facing elevation of the dwelling. At second floor level, No. 65a had a bedroom window. Again, that was not the only source of light to the room, with a good sized roof light to the rear, facing south which would be the main source of light to the room. Furthermore, only the end of the new side extension would sit directly opposite that window, leaving an open aspect to the south.

The Officer said that on balance, considering all of the above factors, it was not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of light or over-dominant impact on 65a. The proposal also fulfilled all other policy requirements of PPS7 and none of the statutory consultees had raised any objections. On that basis it was recommended that full planning permission should be granted.

Proposed by Alderman Carson, seconded by Alderman Fletcher, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be granted.

Alderman Graham advised that he had called in this application and although not totally opposed to the concept of the conversion, he expressed concerns regarding overshadowing. He was of the opinion that the property in question was in close proximity to the adjacent dwelling and could dominate by scale. Also he queried the purpose of the high level window which could create an overlooking aspect and even with patio doors the long downstairs room could suffer from diminished light.

The Officer clarified that the high level window was sited to the rear of the property and the extension was not immediately opposite; rather it would be limited to the front section of No 65A. She gave an assurance that the adjacent house would still receive light from a southerly direction.
On being put to the meeting with 8 voting FOR, 2 voting AGAINST and 4 ABSTENTIONS, the proposal was declared CARRIED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (8)</th>
<th>AGAINST (2)</th>
<th>ABSTAINED (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td>Aldermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Keery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>McIlveen</td>
<td>Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girvan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cathcart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td>McClean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOLVED, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be granted.

4.2. **LA06/2016/0551/O – Lands to the south-east of Knocknatten Avenue and the north-west of Whinney Cottages, Whinney Hill, Cultra**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy documentation (Appendix II)

**DEA:** Holywood and Clandeboye  
**Committee Interest:** Application with 6 or more objections contrary to the Case Officer’s recommendation (21 letters of objection from 19 individual addresses)  
**Proposal:** Outline application for erection of 4 detached dwellings including vehicular access and associated works  
**Site Location:** Lands to south-east of Knocknatten Avenue and north-west of Whinney Cottages, Whinney Hill, Cultra  
**Recommendation:** Approval

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer advised that the application sought outline planning permission for 4 detached dwellings including a vehicular access at lands to the south east of Knocknatten Avenue and to the north west of Whinney Hill Cottages, Holywood. The application had been brought before Planning Committee for consideration as 6 or more representations contrary to the officer’s recommendation have been received.

Continuing, she clarified that the site comprised a parcel of land which was surrounded by existing low density residential development on Knocknatten Avenue, Whinney Hill and Woodlands Avenue. The site sloped downwards in a north westerly direction and had a significant number of mature trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. Access was proposed to be taken via an existing lane off Whinney Hill. By way of the development plan context, under the North Down and Ards Area Plan, the site was located in the Belfast Urban Area Greenbelt. Under the initial Draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan the site was also located outside the settlement limit of Holywood. However, during the Public Inquiry into the draft plan, objections were received to the proposed settlement limit of Holywood in relation to
the area encompassing and surrounding the site. The objections sought the inclusion of this area in the settlement limit. It was the finding of the PAC that The Cottages, Woodlands Avenue and Carlston and Invergourie opposite already represented an urban character and that the natural break in the built development was actually the laneway accessed off Whinney Hill serving 5 Woodlands Avenue. On that basis and also given that a number of infill opportunities existed which could potentially reinforce the urban nature of the area in the future, the PAC recommended that the lands should be included in the settlement limit and this was reflected in the adopted BMAP. Whilst it had now been deemed through legal challenge that BMAP was unlawfully adopted, it was considered that given the proposed development was within the settlement limit as defined following the Public Inquiry, it was highly likely that it shall be reinstated if the plan was adopted again in the future. Therefore, it was considered that the settlement limit as defined in the unlawfully adopted plan should be given determining weight.

Referring to the objections and planning issues, the Officer indicated that the proposed layout showing the position of the dwellings and the mature trees on the site. The sections also showed how the new dwellings would sit in the context of the existing dwellings. A total of 24 letters of objection from 20 separate addresses had been received in relation to the proposed development, 3 of those having been received following the officer’s recommendation to approve the application; 6 letters of support were also received. The main planning concerns raised included:

- The location of the site outside the settlement limit
- Impact on the LLPA, protected trees and wildlife
- Traffic impact
- Loss of privacy and loss of light
- Cumulative impact with future development

She commented that the existing trees were located mainly around the periphery of the site but there were also two stands of trees within its central area. The trees were to be retained and protected during construction and the Council’s Tree Officer was satisfied that adequate separation distances were in place to ensure that the development would not adversely impact upon the trees. The site also lay within a Local Landscape Policy Area as designated in BMAP. The protected trees within the site were referred to in the plan as a notable feature when viewed on the approach from the north along Whinney Hill. The existing trees were to be retained and would remain as a landscape feature from this view. The finished floor level of the proposed dwellings would sit at least 5m below Whinney Hill Cottages and they would not be prominent in the landscape. A detailed ecological report was also submitted with the application and Natural Environment Division was content that there would be no adverse impacts on protected species or priority habitats.

With regard to the traffic aspect, the Officer verified that access to the site would be gained via an existing private lane off Whinney Hill. DFI Roads was content that the use of this access for the 4 dwellings would not result in any road safety issues and that the required visibility splays of 2 x 60m were already in place. As could be seen there was good visibility from the access in both directions along Whinney Hill. Planning permission would also be subject to a condition requiring access from the site onto Woodlands Avenue to be permanently stopped prior to the commencement
of any other development to prevent access from the development onto the Bangor Road.

The Officer maintained that in respect of the loss of privacy and light, the proposed dwellings would be positioned a sufficient distance from existing dwellings to ensure that there would be no unacceptable loss of light or privacy. The new dwellings would sit at a considerably lower level than Whinney Hill Cottages and would be in excess of 40m away. They would also be positioned between 36 and 60m away from the rear of the properties on Knocknatten Avenue also with the benefit of significant screening provided by the existing mature trees along that boundary. Those separation distances were also well in excess of the Creating Places recommended distance of 20m to take account of the sloping site. The closest dwelling to 10 Whinney Hill would come within 12m of its side gable however it would not sit immediately opposite and the mature belt of trees along the boundary will provide good screening. Furthermore, the positioning of windows would be agreed at RM stage to ensure there would be no unacceptable overlooking. Approval would also be subject to a condition withdrawing PD rights to ensure that no future extensions or additional windows could potentially affect amenity.

To summarise, the Officer stated that the proposal was in conformity with the development plan and complied with Planning Policy Statement 7 in that it would not result in any unacceptable damage to the character or residential amenity of the area. The density and plot sizes were comparable to those already found in the area and the generous separation distances would ensure that the amenity of existing dwellings would not be adversely affected. All of the statutory bodies consulted were also content with the proposal and on that basis it was recommended that outline planning permission should be granted.

Councillor McClean questioned the provisions around greenbelt areas and what would follow if the site did not meet planning policy or satisfy infill policy requirements.

In response the Officer explained that the site did not fall into the traditional definition of infill in the countryside but had its own specific set of circumstances. There had been a number of planning applications in that BMAP area and it was within the settlement limit.

Councillor McClean acknowledged the surrounding development but asked if infill policy had been met in this instance.

The Officer stated that infill policy could not be taken in isolation as the North Down & Ards Area Plan had to be considered alongside other policy guidance. With regard to BMAP a public inquiry had been undertaken at that time and justification for the development limit was received. The recommendation was for approval and a planning appeal would result in the same scenario as the PAC had adopted a similar approach.

Councillor McIlveen mentioned that North Down & Ards Area Plan was an extant plan that was so far out of date it weakened the weighting aspect. How much had
been unadopted by BMAP was key. He felt heartened by the PAC decision quoted which allowed additional weight, however wondered if the Council would be open to challenge in the decision it made and how could it ensure it was afforded sufficient protection, i.e. were there other examples.

The Head of Planning commented that case law detailed what weight was to be afforded at successive stage of plan preparation. As a result of an objection which was heard by the PAC the site was recommended for inclusion within the settlement limit of Holywood and that recommendation had been accepted by DOE. She was confident that substantial weight could be attributed as that designation would likely be included in an lawfully adopted plan.

Councillor Hunter made reference to the application having been previously refused due to environmental reasons.

The Officer reassured the Member that that had been a different proposal. The NED had been consulted and confirmed that there would be no detrimental impact upon any animal or plant species. A detailed ecological survey had been carried out and there were provisions to mitigate any potential impact.

Councillor Hunter drew attention to the ancient bluebell woodland which was a rare sighting in Northern Ireland. He was aware that a detailed management plan would be required at the Reserved Matters stage but he believed the matter had to be brought to the forefront now. The woodland was 1000s of years in the making and protection of that habitat deserved more weight.

The Officer stressed that the NED had raised the conservation of the bluebell wood. The Habitat Management Plan would effectively deal with that issue but not necessarily at this point in the process.

The Chairman asked Dr R Wilson to come forward and speak in opposition to the application.

Dr Wilson indicated that there had been 24 objections to the application and highlighted that there was new information pertinent to the granting of planning permission that had not been available when the decision of approval was awarded. The site in question was directly adjacent to a proposed new development named Merchant’s Gate. A public consultation exercise had taken place on 22 August 2018 and this development would be much greater in size, circa 41 dwellings. His contention was that there was no natural boundary and the two sites would share the same access. He was also mindful that they were under the same ownership and development partners and formed two parts of the same large-scale development. This particular application was more environmentally sensitive as it sat on a natural corridor for wildlife and protected species such as bats, badgers, birds and bluebells. He said that the risk of disturbance must be removed and the area managed properly for the future. Dr Wilson voiced unease that a precedent had been set as another application LA06/2018/0379 had been submitted and it was in fact a pre cursor for further substantial development in the same location. He reminded the Committee that each application must be judged in its own right and to bear in mind that overdevelopment would lead to the destruction of the environment. He sought a
delay in the decision until those full plans were presented as it had already taken two years for this application to be finalised and 14 years for this particular site.

At this stage, the Chairman requested Mr McBerney to speak in support of the application.

Mr McBerney followed on from issues raised and thought it important to point out that the application had been in the planning system since 2016. It was an outline application for four dwellings and that an application had not actually been submitted on the adjacent site; rather it was an intention only with no application per se. Referring to the BMAP and attributable weight, he noted the content of the PAC Report and underlined that at that time, agreement seemed logical to extend the development limit to the eastern side of the lane. Whinney Hill Cottages had been a significant development and clearly within the settlement limit of Holywood. The subject plot sat behind those but would be much lower and nestled into the wooded site. He reasoned it sensible to include the site within the development limit as there was an established planning history for development of a wider area. A further level of detail would be presented with the reserved matters application to encompass layout, finishes and ecological impact assessment etc. Mr McBerney maintained that the proposed new build had been carefully planned to address the potential impact on trees and bats; taking into account root protection and the crown spread of trees. At Reserved Matters stage the landscape plan would bolster that protection for future generations which was surely testament to the recommendation for approval. The Council’s Tree Officer had been consulted to assist with design alterations thereby ensuring there would be no adverse impact. He concluded that it was a well-considered application and warranted the decision of approval.

Councillor Hunter asked if the bluebells would be disturbed.

Mr McBerney remarked that the landowner had a duty of care to eradicate the invasive Japanese Knotweed under licence. It entailed quite a complicated process to remove this plant species which unfortunately was interspersed through the bluebells and they too would need to be taken out initially. The management plan would confirm the location of the bluebells, how they were to be removed and translocation back into the site. He recognised that bluebells thrived in that woodland environment and they would be retained. In addition, a detailed design depicting the footprint of the proposed dwellings would also be provided before commencement of the removal process. Approval would be sought from the Environment Agency who would validate the detailed habitat plan.

Councillor Hunter remained unconvinced and dissatisfied at the uprooting of bluebells and their potential translocation.

Mr McBerney verified that such works were carried out regularly and would necessitate the expertise of a reputable, qualified ecologist. On occasion protected badger setts were relocated under licence when it was deemed appropriate to do so to safeguard the species.
In making reference to the Knotweed, Alderman Graham noted that the Planning Officer had not mentioned its existence in her verbal report and it was his understanding that it had to be eradicated before building works could commence.

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer verified that it was contained in the written report before Members and the submission of a Habitat Management Plan was essential. This would also be subject to a condition of any planning approval. Alderman Carson referred to earlier comments made by Dr Wilson in relation to a second application LA06/2018/0379. He had checked this on the planning portal and it pertained to 3 The Cottages, Whinney Hill and four objections had been received.

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer did not have such relevant information to hand.

At this stage, the Chairman asked Mr McBirney to provide further clarification on the matter.

Mr McBirney verified that that application was located to the rear of 3 Whinney Hill Cottages – a proposed dwelling to rear of the site for back garden and relying on same access if this application were approved.

Alderman Fletcher described the aerial views and drawings as three bare sites showing no significant vegetation.

Referring to the aerial views, the Senior Professional and Technical Officer conveyed that the crown spread of the trees could be seen on the periphery with two central stands of trees which were not protected.

Councillor McIlveen did not believe a satisfactory answer was given in relation to the bluebells and presumed they would be dealt with under condition 12. He too expressed concern that the lifting and replanting of bluebells could possibly not fare well. To that end, he wondered if examples of that course of action could be viewed elsewhere. He asked if the methodology and timescales could strengthen that process. Members needed a sense of assurance that at the Reserved Matters stage a high success rate would be achieved.

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer reiterated that the experts at NED were satisfied that it could be performed subject to scrutiny at Reserved Matters stage. The Head of Planning stated that she was content to ensure any reserved matters application was referred back to Planning Committee.

Councillor McIlveen regarded that suggestion as advisable to allow Members to have an input into ensuring there was a greater level of protection offered.

In relation to the various conditions, Alderman Graham enquired into their robustness and if any could be appealed.
The Senior Professional and Technical Officer indicated that conditions could always be appealed but none was included that Officers believed were not enforceable or unnecessary; they were all considered appropriate.

Alderman Graham was encouraged by the detail surrounding the environmental issues highlighting the welcome shift in attitudes by quality developers attempting to preserve natural assets and heritage. He accepted the opinion of approval subject to the application being brought before the Committee at Reserved Matters stage.

Proposed by Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Keery, that planning permission be granted subject to reserved matters being presented to the Committee.

Councillor McClean raised the issue of the opposition to the Notice of Application for the proposed development of 41 dwellings. He questioned if Officers had been aware of that proposal would it have had any bearing or influence on their decision to approve the current application.

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer outlined that Officers were aware of the potential proposal at the end of June. Having said that, there was no legislation in place to stipulate that an application had to be submitted following on from a Planning Application Notice. No weight could be afforded to it as it wasn’t an application. If it did come to fruition any cumulative impact would be assessed at the appropriate time.

Councillor McClean was unhappy that the unlawfully adopted BMAP was given weight when no weight could be given to an imminent proposal for 41 dwellings. Hence, he could not support the decision to approve.

On being put to the meeting with 10 voting FOR, 3 voting AGAINST and 1 ABSTAINING, the proposal was declared CARRIED.

FOR (10) AGAINST (3) ABSTAINED (1)
Aldermen Alderman Alderman
Carson Girvan Girvan
Fletcher Councillors Hunter Hunter
McDowell McClean McClean
Keery
Gibson
Graham

Councillors
Walker
Mcllveen
Dunne
Thompson

RESOLVED, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be granted subject to any reserved matters being presented to Planning Committee.
4.3. **LA06/2016/0976/O – Site 8m North West of 20 Downshire Road, Bangor**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy documentation (Appendix III)

**DEA:** Bangor West  
**Committee Interest:** Application with 6 or more representations contrary to the officer’s recommendation (23 objections)  
**Proposal:** Site for one dwelling  
**Site Location:** 8m north-west of 20 Downshire Road, Bangor  
**Recommendation:** Approval

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer relayed to Members that the application was for a site for a single dwelling 8m north of 20 Downshire Road, Bangor. The application had been brought before Planning Committee for consideration as six or more representations contrary to the officer’s recommendation had been received. The site was located in the north western corner of the existing curtilage of 20 Downshire Road which was a substantial property within the proposed Bangor West Area of Townscape Character. The immediate area was an attractive well established residential neighbourhood characterised by a variety of house types on varied plot sizes. There were a number of mature trees within and along the periphery of the site. It was proposed that access to the site would be via an existing private lane to the immediate west of the site.

She advised that planning permission was previously granted for a two storey dwelling on the site back in December 2006 but was never implemented and had now expired. Since the previous permission was granted there had been a number of changes to the context of the site with the erection of new dwellings including those at 22a-22c and also to planning policy with the introduction of PPS7 Addendum and the proposed ATC designation. Those had all been considered prior to arriving at the recommendation to approve planning permission. Displaying the view of the site from Downshire Road, she commented that the dwelling would be located in behind the trees. The two photographs showed the views along Downshire Road in both directions emerging from the access to the site.

Whilst the application was for outline planning permission, the applicant had submitted additional details to demonstrate how a two storey dwelling can be accommodated on the site without resulting in any unacceptable impact on the amenity of the existing dwellings.

In relation to objections, the Officer verified that a total of 23 letters of objection from 6 individuals and 2 petitions of objection each with 5 signatures were received in relation to the proposed development.

The main planning concerns raised included:

- The impact on the character of the proposed Bangor West ATC  
- Impact on existing trees  
- Impact on the residential amenity of existing dwellings
• Overdevelopment and excessive density
• The cumulative impact with other existing and approved development and potential precedent
• Impact on road safety

However, it was viewed that the impact on the proposed ATC would be minimal. Public viewpoints of the site were extremely limited given the backland location. The size, height and plot size of the dwelling would be comparable to that found in the area. Planners considered that the development would not set a precedent at that location as back land development was already a characteristic of the area and any future applications would be assessed on their own merits. The mature trees to the north and east of the site which were considered to be visually significant and provided good screening would be subject to a condition requiring their retention.

DFI Roads had no objection to the proposal and was satisfied that the existing access onto Downshire Road was adequate. The access widened to approximately 10m where it met Downshire Road and the road at that point was relatively straight with good visibility in both directions. While objections specifically raised concerns about the safety of an access coming out onto the private lane from the site, that was not a matter that could be considered by DFI as it was the point of access onto a public road that was the material consideration in terms of road safety. Furthermore, an access to No. 20 could already be installed at that position under permitted development rights so it must also be taken into account.

The potential impact of the development on the residential amenity of existing dwellings had been considered at great length during the processing of the application. A number of amendments were sought and additional details in the form of a site layout plan and plans of the proposed dwelling were also submitted to demonstrate how a two storey dwelling could be accommodated on the site without having an adverse impact on residential amenity. In particular windows had been carefully positioned and those at first floor level with the potential to overlook would be subject to a condition requiring obscure glazing.

The Officer summarised that the proposal was considered to be in conformity with the development plan and complied with all the relevant policy requirements of Planning Policy Statement 7 in that it would not result in any unacceptable damage to the character or residential amenity of the area. The density and plot size were comparable to those already found in the area and the proposed planning conditions would ensure that the amenity of existing dwellings would not be adversely affected. All of the statutory bodies consulted were also content with the proposal and on that basis it was recommended that outline planning permission should be granted.

Councillor McClean spoke of backland development or ‘garden grabbing’ as it was often referred to and its cumulative impact at that location. He said that Members were regularly informed that each future application was considered on its own merits but he pondered what that actually meant. There was a desire to preserve that Area of Townscape Character and further development should be a careful balance. He asked if Officers could envisage a situation whereby the Council could refuse a backland proposal before there was irreparable damage.
The Officer confirmed that all applications were assessed on their own merits as the context of each site differed in terms of size, screening, visibility to the public, inclusion of trees etc. In terms of an ATC, there was a visual test to be undertaken with critical viewpoints from the road. It was also important to evaluate how an application impacted on the ATC as a whole. She made mention of the fact that there had been numerous backland development on both sides of the Downshire Road.

The Chairman asked Mr Dadley to speak as an objector to the planned proposals.

Mr Dadley conveyed to the Committee that he was speaking on behalf of his wife and the residents of Nos 22a, 22b and 22c Downshire Road. They were of the opinion that the application represented cramming and overdevelopment which could erode the character of that residential location. The objectors had attempted to meet the developer as all neighbours were opposed to the proposal but the applicant appeared to be unwilling to address those concerns to achieve an agreeable solution. The turning circle shown on the plans could not be achieved as residents had plotted the radius standard required. Thus, large family cars and vans would find it nearly impossible to negotiate, which would also lead to an unsafe lane for pedestrians to utilise. He made reference to the abstract from a letter to the applicant in relation to amended plans and stressed that there were no repositions or adjustments. Mr Dadley concluded by stating that adherence to PPS 7 for infill housing was not always an appropriate course of action.

The Chairman invited Mr Stephens to speak in favour of the application.

Speaking in support of the application Mr Stephens emphasised that the purpose of the LDP and policy was to secure orderly development of land and a presumption in favour of development. He detailed that the report was robust and comprehensive, the proposal was compliant with plan and policy, and no substantial objections from consultees. The planning history was a significant material consideration, and no embargo on type of development. Identical approvals at 22a, b, c, and d, Downshire Road as occupied by objectors.

It would blend unobtrusively and form part of urban grain. Given lack of design guidance for ATC proposal had to be assessed in terms of impact on the ATC as a whole. There were limited public views and couldn’t possibly impact on whole of area. Its density would be at lower end, private amenity space was acceptable and over-development was unproven. A total of 14 draft conditions had been placed on the application by way of mitigation. Mr Stephens referred to judgments regarding lack of demonstrable harm.

Highlighting the anxiety of residents, Alderman Girvan sought enlightenment in relation to a health and safety matter regarding the entrance. There was a narrow entrance to the laneway and residents were worried that there was insufficient space at the turning circle.

In reply, Mr Stephens explained that the existing lane served four houses, Nos 20a, 22a, 22b and 22c. It had been calculated that one new house equated to an additional 10 vehicle movements per day. Transport NI’s perspective was that the
lane would provide sufficient access and egress and it had raised no objections, besides it had no remit in respect of a private lane.

Mr Stephens returned to the public gallery after confirming for members that the plot size was 0.3ha.

Turning to the subject of the conditions, Councillor Walker observed that condition 4 stated that the access to the site must be achieved via the lane. He queried why the lane had to be utilised as it was creating an issue.

The Officer advised that it was proposed by the applicant and DFI Roads had supplied that condition to ensure wouldn’t come out of no. 20 as may well require visibility splays. DFI Roads satisfied that splays on lane in place.

In answer to another question from Councillor Walker, the Officer confirmed that it was her understanding that the applicant owned the wall. Apart from the requirement of a small opening further down the lane, there would be minimal impact as the majority of the wall would be retained.

Alderman Fletcher in referring to the objector underlined that the word cramming was an emotive term and requested information about plot sizes in the area in comparison with the site under discussion.

Mr Stephens had clarified that the site was 0.3 hectares and comparable to Nos 22a and 23 but No 18 was smaller in size.

Proposed by Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Thompson, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be granted.

On being put to the meeting with 10 voting FOR, 1 voting AGAINST and 3 ABSTAINING, the proposal was declared CARRIED.

FOR (10)   AGAINST (1)   ABSTAINED (3)  
Aldermen  Councillor  Alderman  
Carson  McClean  Graham  
Fletcher  
McDowell  Councillors  
Girvan  Cathcart  
Keery  Hunter  
Gibson  

Councillors  
Walker  
McIlveen  
Thompson  
Dunne  

RESOLVED, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be granted.
4.4. **LA06/2016//0982/RM – Lands Between Newtownards Road (to South of Donaghadee Rugby Club) and Cannyreagh Road (to north of Nos. 17-33), Donaghadee**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy documentation (Appendix IV)

**DEA:** Bangor East and Donaghadee  
**Committee Interest:** Major application  
**Proposal:** Residential development of 390 dwellings (to include mix of detached, semi-detached, town houses and apartments) with associated landscaping and amenity space and provision of new link road from Newtownards Road to Cannyreagh Road  
**Site Location:** Lands between Newtownards Road (to south of Donaghadee Rugby Club) and Cannyreagh Road (to north of Nos 17-33), Donaghadee  
**Recommendation:** Approval

The Head of Planning explained to Members that this was the submission of Reserved Matters for a 17ha site, zoned for housing within the Ards and Down Area Plan 2015, and which had the benefit of Outline planning permission for 390 dwellings, to include a mix of house types, associated landscaping and amenity space, and provision of a new road link from Newtownards Road to Cannyreagh Road, in Donaghadee.

Outline permission was previously granted on the site in 2012 and latterly in 2015. A local distributor road would provide a throughfare through the site between Newtownards Road to the North and Cannyreagh Road to the south, with internal access roads serving the dwellings branching off it.

A RHT lane was to be installed along the Newtownards Road providing access to the site from the North and mitigating impact on traffic flow. To the south the public road was to be realigned directing the majority of traffic along the new local distributor road. Those road works were to be completed prior to commencement of any other works and the distributor road was to be completed prior to 200 dwellings being occupied. Additionally, no more than 30 dwellings to be accessed from Cannyreagh Road can be occupied prior to delivery of the entire distributor road.

The range of house types encompassed 3 bed townhouses and semis to 3 and 4 bed detached and 2 bed apartments. The scale, massing and design had been assessed and found acceptable and regrading of the topography within the site would ensure the development respected the contours without the need for retaining structures.

Open space provision was in excess of that required within policy for residential developments over 300 units, the majority of existing vegetation was to be retained and there was adequate private amenity space provided.

A 2 hectare area was proposed for open space, in line with the requirements of the area plan surrounding the scheduled rath and including the unscheduled tree ring to the east, maintaining an open aspect and enabling unrestricted views to be maintained.
A range of consultations had taken place on the proposal and no objections were raised, subject to inclusion of appropriate conditions.

The application was recommended for approval, with delegated authority to be awarded for refinement of conditions as appropriate.

Councillor Walker thought it important to set the development in context – the proposal could potentially add to the population of Donaghadee at a ratio of 1:7 so it was a large and significant development. The area had archaeological features, and Tree Preservation Orders existing on it. There was a proposal to have the traffic making a right hand turn on to the main road. The development could bring a further 800 cars in to the town. He thought town cramming was happening in the area and was concerned about the impact that would have on the town.

The Head of Planning informed Councillor Walker that the density was appropriate, as it aligned with the Area Plan key site considerations and so town cramming was not an issue as this was greenfield land zoned for housing. The developer would be required to build roads to the required standard and address the entrance and exit points to the site. A footway was proposed through the site which would link to Moat Street in the centre of the town. The vegetation would be required to be retained under development restrictions.

Alderman Gibson referred to the abandonment order to which the Head of Planning highlighted that that condition would actually be removed from any approval as it was covered under separate legislation, and that the agent could discuss further.

Alderman Girvan discussed the archaeological site in the middle of the development and sought assurance that it would be protected and she asked what would happen after the development was completed. The Head of Planning recognised that it was a specified early Christian site and the HED wanted it to be retained and so the applicant had obligations to identify, protect and record what was happening at the site. Alderman Fletcher wondered would the developer be bound by those conditions in perpetuity. The Head of Planning confirmed that the conditions were lawful and if they were not complied with the Council could take enforcement action accordingly as appropriate.

Alderman Keery believed the Council was being naïve in appearing to overlook that it was in negotiation about a potential Sports Hub at the opposite side of the road and the traffic that would be generated at that point should be considered.

The Head of Planning said that an alternative access point would be looked at for the Sports Hub since that would be a large site.

At this stage the Chairman invited Mr Donaldson to speak in support of the application. Mr Donaldson welcomed the Officer’s recommendation to approve the development. The application had been submitted in October 2016 and it followed on from the renewal of outline planning permission which was granted in March 2015. He said that before addressing the detailed planning considerations, it was important to highlight the overall decision-making context. The following aspects were especially relevant.
First, planning legislation required decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The express purpose of the development plans was ‘to guide the future use of land and inform developers, members of the public, communities, government, public bodies and other interests of the policy framework that was used to determine development proposals’. The site in question had been zoned for housing in March 2009 in the statutory Ards and Down Area Plan 2015. He asked Members to note that there were no local objections to the zoning of the land. Secondly, outline planning permission was granted in 2012 and renewed in 2015. This firmly established the principle of housing development on the application site. He went on to say these were reserved matters submissions, not an application, covering matters set out in the outline approval dealing with siting, design and external appearance, means of access and landscaping.

Thirdly, the site in question was not a high density proposal and the proposed 390 houses equated to approximately 23 dwellings per hectare (9 per acre). Turning to the design he said that the SPPS noted that good design should make positive use of the assets of a site and the characteristics of its surroundings. In this case, the design proposals had been guided by the outline concept plan which sought to respect the mature tree belts and the rath feature. All of the houses would meet or exceed the amenity space guidance in Creating Places. The mixture was approximately 30% detached; 50% semi-detached; and the remaining 20% were townhouses or apartments. Amenity space on the site would equate to 16.6% which comfortably exceeded PPS 8 guidance for 15% for a site of this size. An equipped playground would also be provided.

The principle of housing development at that location had long been established by the Plan zoning and the outline permission. The development would link Cannyreagh Road with Newtownards Road. Condition 2 stated that only 200 houses (just over 50%) could be built, mainly from Newtownards Road until the link road was complete.

The fundamental principle of the design concept approved at outline was to protect the ecological, landscape and amenity features of the site. The tree lined belts, protected trees, the rath feature, drainage channels also needed to be protected. The applicant was fully aware of the responsibility under wildlife legislation hence a qualified ecologist was appointed to advise and report upon bats and badger activity. Reports had been confirmed that the development would not have an adverse impact upon any protected species.

The application had been accompanied by Drainage and Flood Risk Assessments which had informed detailed drainage design. Importantly, that had confirmed that the site was not subject to flooding and drainage from all parts of the site would be attenuated to greenfield run off rate.

He concluded by saying that the outline planning permission had established the principle of housing development at that location. The detailed proposals complied with all of the conditions of the outline permission. The proposal was another step in the planned development of Donaghadee as advocated by the Area Plan. He
believed the proposals would make an attractive and sustainable contribution to the housing needs of the town. The therefore requested that the Committee grant planning permission.

Councillor Walker asked Mr Donaldson if he thought the proposed road arrangement was good for movement and speed of traffic. Mr Donaldson replied that although the Newtownards Road was a busy road, engineers had looked at and confirmed that the road proposal would work and that it would not interfere with the nearby sports club. Councillor Walker believed that it could become a ring road around the town and the provision of roads was unsuitable and would cause mayhem in Donaghadee.

Councillor Walker proposed, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that a site visit be scheduled to provide Committee members an understanding of the potential impact of the proposed distributor road on the community and Primary School located on the Cannyreagh, Northfield and Killaughey Roads. An impact which was difficult or impossible to visualize from the officers’ report.

The Head of Planning said that she noted the Member’s concern, however, it was already zoned for housing following extensive investigations and also had the benefit of Outline Planning Permission. It would be difficult to refuse on that ground since it was in conformity with the Development Plan.

Alderman Graham understand the Member’s concerns but explained that the area was zoned for housing. There was little to be gained from viewing the site since the statutory bodies had already given an opinion and the Council did not have a legal right to stop development. A meeting of this sort would only delay something which had already had two outline permissions.

Other Members were in support of Alderman Graham’s comments.

When a vote was taken 2 voted FOR a site meeting, 7 voted AGAINST and 4 ABSTAINED. The proposal therefore FELL.

FOR (2) AGAINST (7) ABSTAINED (4)
Alderman Girvan Keery Alderman Fletcher
Councillor Walker Gibson McDowell
  Councillors Graham Councillors Cathcart
    Hunter McIlveen McClean
    Thompson Dunne

Proposed by Councillor Dunne, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the recommendation for planning permission be adopted.

When put to a vote 9 voted FOR the recommendation, 2 voted AGAINST and 2 ABSTAINED. The recommendation was APPROVED.
PC.04.09.18

FOR (9) AGAINST (2) ABSTAINED (2)
Aldermen Alderman Alderman
Fletcher Girvan McDowell
Gibson Councillor Councillor
Graham Walker Cathcart
Keery
Councillors
Hunter
Mcllveen
Thompson
Dunne
McClean

RESOLVED, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be Granted.

COMFORT BREAK

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9.00 pm.

MEETING RESUMED at 9.15 pm.

4.5. LA06/2018/0190/O – Adjacent and 10 metres to the south of 103 Main Street, Conlig

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy documentation (Appendix V)

DEA: Holywood and Clandeboye
Committee Interest:
Proposal: Called in by Councillor Dunne: ‘As both sites had previously been subject to Outline approvals for infill dwellings and garages and that there has been no change to the Planning Policy for this area since the previous approvals, approximately three and five years ago respectively’
Site Location: Adjacent and 10 metres to the south of 103 Main Street, Conlig, Newtownards
Recommendation: Refusal

The Head of Planning articulated that the then Department of the Environment granted approval for an infill dwelling on each of the sites (Items 4.5 and 4.6) under PPS 21 CTY 8, the northern site gained permission in 2014, the second southern gained permission in 2013, both on the basis that despite the fact that there were agricultural buildings on the site, and no gap site actually then existed, that there would be no demonstrable harm in permitting the dwellings.

The applicant did not submit reserved matters for either of the above planning applications within the requisite timeframes and therefore the Council did not attribute determining weight to those previous decisions for reasons which she would outline. Each case was determined on its own merits; previous decisions were not binding. Only court decisions were binding, previous planning decisions were not
binding. There was nothing in law to dictate that you must follow a previous decision. There were reasons why the Council had approached these applications differently whilst still taking into account the planning history and the then DOE’s approach to the policy. The policy CTY 8 stated the following:

Planning permission would be refused for a building which created or added to a ribbon of development. An exception would be permitted for the development of a small gap site:

- sufficient only to accommodate up to a maximum of two houses
- within an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage
- and provided that respects the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size, scale, siting and plot size
- and met other planning and environmental requirements.

The Head of Planning indicated that for the purpose of this policy, the definition of a substantial and built up frontage included a line of three or more buildings along a frontage without accompanying development to the rear. She contended that those buildings did have accompanying development to the rear, and that account could not be taken of the infill dwelling between Nos 103 and 101 Main Street, Conlig as it had only the benefit of Outline approval and had not been constructed. That was in line with PAC decisions as there was no building in that position. It followed that there was no existing ‘gap site’ as stipulated in the policy. The J&A went further to state that in considering what circumstances two dwellings might be approved, it would not be sufficient to simply show how two houses could be accommodated – rather the existing pattern of development must be taken into account.

The immediate area was characterised by dwellings on bigger plots, with larger frontages, and the Planning Department considered approval of this application and the adjacent application would create more restricted plots which failed to respect the existing development pattern along Main Street in this location, in terms of their size, scale and plot, so offending CTY 8.

The outbuildings referred to were in-situ on both application sites, and therefore the Planning Department did not accept that a gap-site as required by policy existed. In line with appeal decisions, such as 2015/A0020 which represented a similar situation in which the then Department accepted there was a gap site, the Commission accepted the now LPA’s position that as the plot had two outbuildings on it, it did not form part of an existing gap within a substantial and continuously built up frontage, previously identified and therefore failed to comply with Policy CTY 8.

A further PAC decision referred to the need to consider the entire frontage of each property’s curtilage to the public road, rather than the frontage of each dwelling, and that each case must be considered in its own visual context (appeal2015/A0052). The PAC also held that it was the context of the site as it stood at the time of making the decision that one must base a judgment on, that was in relation to not being able to take into consideration partially constructed buildings or approved but not commenced buildings as part of the substantial and continuously built up frontage,
and the same position applied in relation to Policy CTY 8 – there must be a physical gap to comply with the policy. (appeal ref 2016/A0005)

The Head of Planning commented that Officers had previously excluded buildings which could potentially be built under Permitted Development Rights as contributing toward a frontage for this policy, and they were applying it from the perspective of there being no gap site. Were the application to be refused and appealed, and the applicant to demolish the buildings, the Planning Department would be submitting a claim for costs awards for changing the circumstances, but continue to argue its reasons for refusal in respect of there being no gap site, and development not respecting the existing development pattern of development along this stretch of Main Street in terms of plot sizes, namely nos 107, 103 and 101. That would be on the basis of whether the Planning Department accepted that the laneway between Main Street and Newtownards Road as not breaking up the frontage.

She concluded that the application was recommended for refusal as it was not considered to comply with Policy CTY 8 and thus CTY 1.

At this stage in the meeting, the Chairman invited Mr Donaldson to come forward to speak in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. The applicant Mr McCullough also came forward.

Mr Donaldson outlined that the application site was within the rural area, but only about 200 metres south of Conlig village centre. It was within the 30 mph zone and there were bus stops almost beside it. Referring to compliance with policy CTY8, he said the first step was to establish whether a substantial and continuously built frontage existed at that location. The policy referred to a line of at least three buildings with a common frontage to a road. He believed it was clear that Nos 101, 103 and 107 all had frontages to Main Street. Additionally, the two farm sheds which were adjacent to Main Street had frontages within that row of development, so there were more than three buildings within the continuous frontage.

He mentioned that the second step was to consider whether that site constituted a *small gap sufficient only to accommodate up to a maximum of two houses* and he felt that the policy wording there was important. It referred to a ‘small’ gap to ensure that infills were not permitted in locations where there were sprawling gaps between houses, which would lead to loss of rural character. This was clearly a small gap, which could accommodate only two houses and was entirely in line with the Minister’s comments when he introduced PPS21 to the NI Assembly stating: ‘if there is space for two dwellings between 3 dwellings the solution is fairly clear….if Planning Officers argue against that it will create a difficulty, the policy is clear, and Planning Officers should apply it consistently and clearly across all divisions and Councils in Northern Ireland’.

Mr Donaldson spoke of the third step to consider if the proposal respected the existing development pattern in terms of size, scale, siting and plot size. He commented that the existing development pattern along this frontage was quite compact, with relatively small gaps between buildings. The barn currently on the site had a narrow frontage to the public road and that clearly formed part of the
established character. The proposed development would remove the farm barn and replace it with a new dwelling, thus continuing to respect this established pattern.

Turning to the issue of planning history, Mr Donaldson informed Members of its importance in this case. This site was granted permission in August 2014 (under W/2014/0153/O). The PPS21 policy context had not changed at all since that was granted. The importance of the planning history was also highlighted in William Orbinson QC’s book on ‘Planning Appeals Principles.’ In this he commented that ‘if there is a history of previous approvals for like development on the site, a change in circumstances must be demonstrated for an appeal to fail’. Clearly in this case he thought there had been no change in circumstances and no change in policy. Whilst accepted that the Council may not be bound by previous DOE decisions (especially if elected Members wanted to reflect local opinions), it was difficult to understand why the professional Planning Officers had arrived at a different conclusion from that in 2014 when the only significant change in this instance had been the change in employer.

To summarise, Mr Donaldson believed the balance in favour of sustainable development should apply and sustainable reasons for the granting of planning permissions included:

- the proposals were in a sustainable location, within the 30 mph limit, beside bus stops and within easy walking distance of the village facilities
- the Council had accepted in the 2018 approval to the north of No 103 that there was a substantial and continuous built up frontage at this location
- the redevelopment of the barn would represent a small gap within the built-up frontage
- the officer report confirmed that there would be no loss of rural character
- there had been no change in policy or circumstances since the previous approval was granted in 2014.

He asked that approval was granted or alternatively, the Committee may consider that a site visit would be beneficial.

In response to a question from Alderman Graham, Mr Donaldson made reference to CTY8 compliance whereby a substantial and continuously built up frontage could be obtained from properties at 101, 103, the two derelict buildings and then 107. He maintained they all had frontages onto Main Street, Conlig and there was clearly a small gap which could accommodate two houses. The proposals would also respect the existing development pattern regarding scale and plot size. He further clarified that the barns had a narrow frontage which formed part of the existing character. Those barns could easily be removed and replaced with dwellings as under the remit of PPS21, the context had not changed and would respect the sustainable development required at that location. A site visit could be accommodated if Members so wished.

Alderman Graham asked why the applicant had not pursued a Reserved Matters application.
Mr Donaldson elucidated to Members that the family had run a dairy farm for many years but their grazing land had been divided in two by the busy dual carriageway which had posed obvious operational difficulties. Three years ago they had taken the decision to purchase a new farm in the Holywood Hills which had made the previous farm redundant. In hindsight, the applicant had realised he should have submitted a Reserved Matters application but had been focusing on his new farm.

Alderman Girvan said that without the relevant planning expertise it was difficult to understand what was meant by a gap site. As two rundown buildings were already there, why could the footprints of those not be utilised to form an improvement.

Mr Donaldson agreed that that was a good question and he would ask the Planning Officers to apply a wider judgement in this instance. The proposals represented an opportunity to replace old buildings with new dwellings causing no demonstrable harm to that area. He was also mindful of the strong planning history in connection with those plots and asked for a balanced approach to award approval.

Alderman Girvan acknowledged the dilemma of Members disagreeing with the decision of planners and the requirement of a valid planning reason to do so and asked Mr Donaldson what he thought.

Mr Donaldson was of the viewpoint that this application was presented in an unusually sustainable location with bus stops. He recapped that both barns were in small gaps and there had been no change in policy or circumstances since approval for redevelopment was first granted.

Alderman Gibson expressed the opinion that the planning history gave strength to the argument. Even though Officers were emphasising there were no gap sites, approval had been given.

Mr Donaldson said that the applications had been resubmitted due to the fact that outline permission had expired in August 2017. At no point did the applicant or himself have any inkling that the Officers would be taking a different stance.

Councillor McClean wondered about the sale of the land and if the two buildings being discussed were part of that sale or indeed was there any other purpose suggested for them.

Mr Donaldson verified that the property had been a longstanding family dairy farm that had been relocated to a superior location for the intention of grazing animals. That move had obviously rendered the old buildings redundant and No 103 and the two barn sites were part of a sales agreement for development purposes. To that end, they were set in a sustainable context.

Responding to questions from Councillor McClean, the Head of Planning described how a ribbon was dependent upon the circumstances of each case, i.e. the particular dwellings could be set back from a road or positioned close to a road. She added that the current location was sited within the countryside and outside the settlement development limit of Conlig. On that basis it was under the auspices of countryside
policies and the proposals were considered on how they affected the countryside and if they were detrimental to its character.

Taking those comments on board, Alderman Graham enquired about the architect’s contribution and how the Officer’s report stated that it was not a gap site. He asked why the existing structures could not be demolished to allow rebuilding.

The Head of Planning mentioned the context of the applicant having gained previous approvals for infill on two sites. She reiterated that there was not a gap site in existence and the introduction of further houses at that location would create a ribbon of development. Planning Officers were following the approach taken by the PAC and similar applications had been refused in the past. She underlined that although they were not bound by the decisions of the DOE, they had to abide with the situation found at the time of making the decision. She further stated that as described by the agent, he was relying on the outbuildings as contributing to the continuous and substantially built up frontage, yet these were the buildings that need to be removed to form a gap site in accordance with policy.

Alderman Graham accepted that they were not bound by the DOE decisions but highlighted that if those houses had been constructed six months after the plans had been passed, they would be sited there today. Although now lapsed, planning permission had been granted in 2014 and only expired the previous year. He did not wish the Council to now run the risk of making harsh decisions and to be viewed as undertaking a rigid approach.

In reply, the Head of Planning reported that the applicant had not submitted a Reserved Matters application and had therefore allowed the permissions to lapse. Officers had the responsibility of ensuring planning policy was applied in a consistent manner.

Alderman Fletcher intervened and asked when was a gap site not a gap site? As far as he was concerned any site was a potential site if buildings were knocked down and rebuilt.

The Head of Planning restated that they were not gap sites as there was not a gap as such. In addition, the two sites had not been cleared and the access laneway created a break within the frontage.

At this stage of the discussion, the Head of Planning underlined that the Case Officer did not agree that it was a gap site, as the ‘agricultural stone building consumed the majority of area of the site’.

From a hypothetical point of view, Councillor McClean asked if the farmhouse had been sold, the two barns demolished and a new application submitted by the new owner, would a decision of approval have been offered.

The Head of Planning commented that the fact still remained that there was no gap site and the laneway broke up the frontage facing onto the main road.
Alderman Graham felt it was fair to say that the replacement of an old barn with a domestic dwelling would have no effect on the density along the frontage. Having listened carefully to the debate, Alderman Girvan made the difficult proposal of rejecting the Planning Officers’ recommendation to refuse the application.

Proposed by Alderman Girvan, seconded by Alderman Graham, that planning permission be granted to take account of previous planning history and approval given, compliance with countryside policy CTY8 with no loss to the rural character or density of the area, no negative impact on the surrounding village area and there was a gap site available within a continuously built up frontage.

As seconder, Alderman Graham noted that it was certainly a complex issue but Members were attempting to solve a problem. The proposal implied removal of the existing structure and replacement with a new dwelling. It complied with the remit of CTY8 and the Council was satisfied that there would be no adverse impact upon the amenity of the area. He further observed that if the Reserved Matters application had been submitted in a timely manner without the distraction of relocation to a new farm, then the two new houses would have been built.

Councillor Walker realised that it was not an easy decision to overturn the determination of Planning Officers but it seemed unfair that the approval was in place and there had been no objections received.

On being put to the meeting with 10 voting FOR, 2 voting AGAINST and 1 ABSTENTION, the proposal was declared CARRIED.

FOR (10) AGAINST (2) ABSTAINED (1)
Aldermen Alderman Alderman
Fletcher McDowell Cathcart
Girvan Councillor
Keery
Gibson
Graham
Councillors
McCLean
Walker
Hunter
Thompson
Dunne

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Girvan, seconded by Alderman Graham, that planning permission be granted to take account of previous planning history and approval given, compliance with countryside policy CTY8 with no loss to the rural character or density of the area, no negative impact on the surrounding village area and there was a gap site available within a continuously built up frontage.

4.6. **LA06/2018/0193/O – 30 Metres to the South of 103 Main Street, Conlig**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy documentation (Appendix VI)
DEA: Holywood and Clandeboye
Committee Interest: Called in by Councillor Dunne: 'As both sites had previously been subject to Outline approvals for infill dwellings and garages and that there had been no change to the Planning Policy for this area since the previous approvals, approximately three and five years ago respectively'
Proposal: Proposed infill dwelling and garage (House 2 – read in conjunction with Item 4.5)
Site Location: 30 metres to the south of 103 Main Street, Conlig, Newtownards
Recommendation: Refusal

Bearing in mind the previous decision, it was stated by the Head of Planning that the circumstances were the same and to that effect it was put to Members as to whether they wished to proceed on the same grounds as the previous Item.

Proposed by Councillor Thompson, seconded by Alderman Keery, that planning permission be granted to take account of previous planning history and approval given, compliance with countryside policy CTY8 with no loss to the rural character or density of the area, no negative impact on the surrounding village area and there was a gap site available within a continuously built up frontage.

Referring to the lengthy discussion that had previously occurred, Alderman Keery was happy to second the proposal.

On being put to the meeting with 10 voting FOR, 2 voting AGAINST and 1 ABSTENTION, the proposal was declared CARRIED.

FOR (10)                   AGAINST (2)                     ABSTAINED (1)
Aldermen                 Alderman                         Councillor
Fletcher                  McDowell                        Alderman
Girvan                    Councillor                      McDowell
Keery                     McIlveen
Gibson
Graham
Councillors
McClean
Walker
Hunter
Thompson
Dunne

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Thompson, seconded by Alderman Keery, that planning permission be granted to take account of previous planning history and approval given, compliance with countryside policy CTY8 with no loss to the rural character or density of the area, no negative impact on the surrounding village area and there was a gap site available within a continuously built up frontage.

4.7. LA06/2018/0290/F – Car Park adjacent to Copelands Marina, the Quarry, Donaghadee
PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy documentation (Appendix VII)

**DEA:** Bangor East and Donaghadee  
**Committee Interest:** Application on land in which the Council had an interest  
**Proposal:** Temporary curved box steel frame shelter/canopy for over a vessel for restoration purposes  
**Site Location:** Car park adjacent to Copelands Marina, The Quarry, Donaghadee  
**Recommendation:** Approval

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer informed Members that the application was for the erection of a temporary shelter for the Sir Samuel Kelly Lifeboat to facilitate survey of it and some restoration work. The site was located at the car park adjacent to Copelands Marina, The Quarry, Donaghadee.

The application was before the Committee as it lay on land in which the Council had an interest. The site lay within the Donaghadee Settlement Limit and adjacent to, but not within, The Commons and coastline LLPA.

With regard to planning policy the aim of the SPPS was to protect the undeveloped coast from inappropriate development. With regard to SPPS that was an appropriate proposal for a coastal location since it involved the restoration of a locally important sea vessel. There would be no loss of car parking as the land was already fenced off for the boat. The structure would not exacerbate flooding and the Rivers Agency had been consulted and had responded with no objection.

The structure would be 5.5 metres in height so will not be dominant. It would be small scale and limited to the existing fenced off site. The proposal was for a temporary structure being for the restoration of a locally important vessel for a 5-year period.

The covering material for the structure was to be agreed and could be conditioned in the decision notice.

Five letters of objection had been received, 3 of which were from separate addresses and there was 1 petition of objection. The main planning concerns raised were noise and nuisance, pollution and environmental impact, flooding, visual impact, health and safety impact of structure in high winds, potential glare, loss of car parking and disruption.

It was noted that the noise and nuisance that may be caused by the restoration process would have a 44metre separation distance from residential dwellings and the canopy should actually help to limit the volume of noise which was already occurring. A condition to restrict the hours of work would be placed on the permission.

As already reported the structure would not exacerbate any existing surface water/flooding issues on the site. It had been detailed in the plans that the structure would be secured to the ground and foundations would be laid for the structure. The details to be submitted with regards to the covering of the shelter would ensure that
any potential impact of glare would be minimised. There would be no loss of parking since the area was already fenced off and unusable for parking at present.

The disruption caused by the erection of the shelter was an unavoidable part of the development process. The proposal was some distance away from residential properties and therefore it could not be argued that there would be a loss of amenity.

The HED had commented that the proposal would not have an impact on the setting of the Harbour and therefore approval was recommended for the proposal.

The Chairman invited Mr Millar, Donaghadee Residents Association, to address the Committee to speak against the proposal. Mr Millar voiced concern over plans to use this proposal to gain a future approval for a heritage centre on the site and had details of a petition against the proposal. He asserted that the intention was for a heritage centre, and whilst agreeing that the lifeboat was better out on display it shouldn’t be a botch job in middle of car park. The money could be spent on restoration and the scheme scrapped after five years. There has been no consultation in terms of health and safety risks, and this would be unsightly, and no neighbours had been notified of the proposal. There would likely be storm damage in times of high winds, and whilst frame may be bolted to ground the cover would not. There may be chemicals used in the restoration which could leak into puddles and many people walked their dogs in this area. The Council hasn’t looked at the site in four years except to erect a fence around it.

Councillor Walker thanked Mr Millar for his comments but stressed that the decision to be made could only be made on planning grounds alone.

Mr Miller stated that he had submitted evidence in photographs of flooding on the site. There would be damage caused by the top blowing off the frame and chemicals had potential to leak into soakaways.

Alderman McDowell asked Mr Miller for confirmation that no work had taken place to the boat in four years so therefore no noise had been experienced, to which Mr Miller agreed.

Councillor McIlveen referred to the temporary nature of the proposal and whether the Planning Department considered that this would set a precedent for future development of a heritage centre. The Officer responded to state that this was a small structure for a single boat in an area already fenced off. A proposal for a heritage centre would be on a much larger scale and be permanent and would be subject to a separate assessment, but approval of this proposal was not considered to set a precedent.

Proposed by Councillor Walker, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the planning permission be approved.

RESOLVED, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be granted.

Councillor Dunne left the meeting at this stage – 11.06pm
4.8. **LA06/2017/1256/F – Cloughy Pavilion, Main Road, Cloughey**

**PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:**- Copy documentation (Appendix VIII)

**DEA:** Ards Peninsula  
**Committee Interest:** Land owned by Council and more than 6 representations contrary to Officer’s report  
**Proposal:** Proposed two storey extension to existing Pavilion to include a balcony and associated alterations as well as other works including a paladin fence and disabled parking  
**Site Location:** Cloughey Pavilion, Main Road, Cloughey  
**Recommendation:** Approval

The Officer informed members that the application was located at Cloughey Pavilion, Main Road, Cloughey, and was for a two storey extension to existing Pavilion to include a balcony, associated alterations, as well as a paladin fence and the provision of disabled parking. The application was being presented at Committee as it was on land owned by the Council and also had 6 or more representations contrary to the case officer’s recommendation.

She advised that the proposal lay outside the settlement limit of Cloughey with regard to the Ards and Down Area Plan 2015. The site also lay within an LLPA and an Area of Constraint on mineral development and was located adjacent to but not within an Area of special scientific interest, a RAMSAR site and SPA.

Turning to policy considerations, she mentioned that as the proposal was outside the settlement limit PPS21 policy CTY1 applied and PPS8 Policy OS3 applied. CTY1 of PPS21 allowed for development in the countryside in relation to outdoor sport and recreational uses in accordance with PPS8.

This proposal was considered an acceptable use in countryside under OS3 of PPS8 as the extension was ancillary to the sports uses, was designed to a high standard as far as was practicable, was of a scale appropriate to the local area and was sympathetic to the surrounding environment in terms of its siting, layout and landscape treatment. It was important to note the eclectic mix of building types in the immediate area and that the roof height of the extension did not exceed the ridge height of the existing building. The proposed facility took into account the needs of people with disabilities and had provided two disabled parking spaces where there was currently no provision. Policy CTY13 and 14 of PPS21 were also complied with.

The Officer highlighted that the road network could safely handle the extra vehicular traffic that the proposal would generate and satisfactory arrangements were provided for access, parking, drainage and waste disposal.

Furthermore, a Habitat Regulation Assessment was undertaken by SES and it was content that there would be no impact on the SPA/Ramsar.

With regard to representations received, there were 19 letters of objection from 12 separate addresses and the following issues were raised:
• Potential disturbance to ASSI – NIEA had responded to confirm the site was not within the designated area and conditions would be attached to any permission to ensure its protection
• Impact on traffic and increased footfall – the pavilion was modest as it stood and the extension was modest and unlikely to create a lot of traffic. There was an extensive public car park that at the time of site visit was virtually empty.
• Building too high and was not in character of area – the building did not go above the existing ridge height. With regards to character of the area there was a mix of building types in the immediate vicinity and this proposal would not cause an impact on the character of the area
• Noise and pollution – no air pollution would result from an extension of ancillary accommodation to a sports facility. In relation to noise, there would be a condition to limit opening hours as suggested by environmental health. The proposal was acceptable given its proposed sports use
• Overlooking from Balcony – there was a separation distance of 40m to 17 Main Road from the front balcony which was sufficient. No properties lay to the rear of the site where the second balcony was proposed

She concluded that approval was recommended.

Councillor McIlveen remarked that he was familiar with the site and had visited the facility. He recognised that it was a modest extension which did not increase the height of the building and was fulfilling a local community need.

Agreeing that it was a wonderful amenity for the area, Alderman Keery made mention of other locations such as Millisle, Bangor East and Donaghadee that he felt were being neglected.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be granted.

Councillor McIlveen left the meeting at this stage – 11.15pm

4.9. LA06/2018/0228/F – Land Opposite 47 Harbour Road, Portavogie

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy documentation (Appendix IX)

DEA: Ards Peninsula
Committee Interest: Land owned by Council
Proposal: The erection of a polished black granite war memorial and access path
Site Location: Land opposite 47 Harbour Road, Portavogie
Recommendation: Approval

The Officer stated that that the application was for the erection of a polished black granite war memorial and access path. The site was located at land opposite 47 Harbour Road, Portavogie. The application was being presented at committee as it was on land in which the Council had an interest.
She reported that the proposal measured 180cm by 180cm by 180 cm and was made out of high quality materials and a simplistic design. All consultees were content with the proposal.

Turning to the development plan consideration, this proposal was within the settlement limit of Portavogie and there were no other designations affecting the site. Looking to the Planning Policy and Strategic Planning Policy statement for Northern Ireland, she confirmed that the proposal would not prejudice public safety nor would it detract from the character of the area.

With regard to PPS 2: Natural Heritage, there would be no impact on any European Designated sites. Under PPS 3: the safety of pedestrians and road users – they would not be impacted upon by this proposal.

This application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Walker enquired as to the rationale for the Committee having to listen to the full recommendation from Officers when Members were sufficiently content to approve the application.

In response, the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning conveyed that the Council’s legal representatives considered it good practice to present all the relevant information and allow for discussion in case there was any future challenge to an application, as outlined within the Planning Protocol.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McClean, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the recommendation be adopted and that Planning Permission be granted.

Alderman Gibson left the meeting at this stage – 11.18pm

5. **UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 20 August 2018 from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that there had been no new decisions since the last report.

New Appeals Lodged

The following appeals were lodged with the Planning Appeals Commission on 3 August 2018

- **Appeal reference:** 2018/A0059
- **Application Reference:** LA06/2017/1098/O
- **Appeal by:** Mr Aubrey Greer
- **Subject of Appeal:** Dwelling
- **Location:** Land immediately to the south of 31 Killinakin Road, Killinchy

- **Appeal reference:** 2018/E0025
Application Reference: LA06/2015/0090/CA  
Appeal by: Mr Hamilton  
Subject of Appeal: Alleged unauthorised erection of modular dwelling with concrete foundations and concrete base, associated hardstanding for parking and creation of access laneway  
Location: Land approximately 170m north west of 69 Newtownards Road, Comber

Appeal reference: 2018/A0049  
Application Reference: LA06/2018/0178/A  
Appeal by: Mr Stephen Kirk  
Subject of Appeal: Shop signage – flat (low voltage LED illumination concealed below eaves signage)  
Location: 2a Bingham Street East, Bangor

Hearings Scheduled

Hearings into the appeals lodged in relation to Fishquarter Quarry, Kircubbin, had been scheduled for hearing in Ards Small Business Centre, Sketrick House, Jubilee Road, Newtownards at 10.00am on 27 September 2018. The Commission had informed the Council that the challenge to the Council’s EIA determination would not be heard on that date. It would instead be held in abeyance until the legal grounds of the appeal were determined.

Additional Matter

Attached for Members’ information was the exchange of correspondence between the Head of Planning and the Deputy Chief Commissioner in relation to a decision made on an appeal at Craigdarragh Road, Helen’s Bay on 6 June 2018. Following discussion with the Council’s legal advisers it was not proposed to pursue the matter further.

Details of appeal decisions, new appeals and scheduled hearings could be viewed at www.pacni.gov.uk.

RECOMMENDED that Members note the content of this report.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the recommendation be adopted.

6. PLANNING BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT – JULY 2018

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that the Planning Budgetary Control Report covered the 4-month period 1 April to 31 July 2018 and was set out. The net cost of the service was showing an underspend of £46,019 (15.0%).

Explanation of Variance
A Budgetary Control Report by Income and Expenditure for Planning was, also, shown which analysed the overall favourable variance (£46,019) by expenditure (£46,073 favourable) and income (£54 adverse).

**PLANNING**

**Expenditure - £46.1k (6.9%) better than budget to date.** The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following:

a. Payroll £45.1k favourable due to vacancies. Vacant HPTO, PTO and administration posts were in the process of being filled. It was hoped they would be filled by August / September.

**Income - £0.1k (0.0%) worse than budget to date.** Planning application income was now back in line with budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual £</th>
<th>Year to Date Budget £</th>
<th>Variance £</th>
<th>Annual Budget £</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Planning</td>
<td>260,581</td>
<td>306,600</td>
<td>(46,019)</td>
<td>1,065,900</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>260,581</td>
<td>306,600</td>
<td>(46,019)</td>
<td>1,065,900</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Actual £</th>
<th>Expenditure Budget £</th>
<th>Variance £</th>
<th>Income Budget</th>
<th>Variance £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Planning</td>
<td>618,927</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>(46,073)</td>
<td>(358,346)</td>
<td>(358,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>618,927</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>(46,073)</td>
<td>(358,346)</td>
<td>(358,400)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED that the Committee notes this report.
AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Girvan, seconded by Councillor Thompson, that the recommendation be adopted.

7. **DRAFT LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS) REGULATIONS**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 20 August 2018 from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing the undernoted:

**Background**

1. The Department for Communities (the Department) had sought the views of councils on the draft Local Government (Consequential Amendments) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2018 (the draft Regulations).

2. This report wished to inform Members of the suggested amendments that the Department intended to make in relation to Pre-Determination Hearings for planning applications.

3. The local government reform programme, which took full effect in April 2015, reduced the number of district councils and gave them the power to carry out additional functions. The key pieces of legislation that provided for this reform were:

   - the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 (the 2014 Act), which provided for the repeal and replacement of significant parts of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 1972 (the 1972 Act) and in so doing placed a range of new requirements upon district councils, particularly in relation to their administrative and governance regimes;

   - the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011, which reformed the planning system and gave district councils responsibility for determining most planning applications; and

   - the Local Government (Boundaries) Act (Northern Ireland) 2008, which reduced the number of local government districts (and as a consequence the number of councils).

4. As a result of changes brought into effect by those three Acts, there had been an impact upon some legislation already on the statute book, and a number of minor and consequential anomalies had emerged.

5. The draft Regulations were a technical piece of legislation and would provide for the amendment of legislation that had been impacted as a consequence of local government reform legislation. A number of minor and consequential anomalies had emerged which required amending.
6. The Department stated that the Local Government (Northern Ireland) 2014 Act included an enabling power to make consequential amendments in connection with its own provisions and those of the other two Acts listed above.

7. The Department proposed to use that power to make Regulations to rectify the minor and consequential anomalies (including the references to former council names and districts) in other legislation. The Department considered the draft Regulations to be technical in nature. In making the draft Regulations the Department did not propose to introduce any new policies or give effect to any policy changes.

Proposed amendment

Decision taken by Councils following a Pre-determination Hearing

8. Regulation 6 and regulation 7(2) of the draft Regulations were linked. Regulation 6 would provide for amendment of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 (the 2011 Planning Act) and regulation 7(2) would amend the 2014 Local Government Act.

9. The intention of those new Regulations was to correct perceived anomalies in both the Planning and Local Government Acts relating to pre-determination hearings on planning applications.

10. Section 30 (pre-determination hearings) of the 2011 Planning Act required the Council to carry out a pre-determination hearing for certain planning applications before the application is determined. Those primarily related to applications notified by the Council to the Department for Infrastructure where the Department then declined to use its powers of call in under section 29 of the 2011 Planning Act.

11. Examples of notifiable applications included:

   - Major development applications that the Council was minded to approve but where a statutory consultee had raised significant concerns; or
   - applications for development where the Council was the applicant, had a financial interest, or its land was involved and the proposed development would be significantly contrary to the local development plan.

12. However, at present, if a pre-determination hearing was carried out by the Council, either on a voluntary basis or as a requirement under Section 30 of the Planning Act, then under the Council’s Standing Orders the Planning Committee was empowered to make the final decision.

13. The Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee also set out that the Planning Committee would take the final decision on any application which had been subject to a Pre-determination hearing.
14. The new Regulations were aimed at ensuring that in future situations where a
council held a pre-determination hearing for a planning application that the final
decision on such proposals was taken by the Full Council, rather than the
Council's Planning Committee.

15. If the amendments sought by the Department for Communities were
introduced, then all councils would be legislatively barred from delegating
decision-making on those planning applications involving a pre-determination
hearing. Rather all such decisions would in future fall to the full Council and the
Council's Standing Orders would need to be amended to reflect that change.

16. The proposed legislative change would also include all cases where the
Planning Committee considered that a pre-determination hearing would be
beneficial to the decision-making process, even though not required by law.

Officer Comments

17. In summary the amendments would mean that any planning application which
was the subject of a pre-determination hearing must be determined by the Full
Council and not the Planning Committee. Officers were of the opinion that the
Planning Committee was best place to determine all planning applications as
that was the committee with the appropriate expertise and experience to deal
with such matters.

RECOMMENDED:

i) that the Council submits the following response to the Department regarding
the proposed amendments in relation to Pre-Determination Hearings:

ii) The Council does not agree that any planning application which is the subject
of a pre-determination hearing should be determined by the full Council. The
Council submits that a council's Planning Committee is the appropriate
committee with the expertise and experience to determine all planning
applications.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded
by Councillor McClean, that the recommendation be adopted.

TERMINATION OF MEETING

The meeting terminated at 11.20pm.
ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Environment Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Wednesday, 5 September 2018 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor Martin
Alderman: Fletcher
Councillors: Boyle Hunter
Cathcart McAlpine
Cummings Smart
Douglas Wilson
Dunlop Woods
Edmund

Officers: Director of Environment (D Lindsay), Head of Assets and Property Services (P Caldwell), Head of Waste and Cleansing Services (N Martin), Head of Regulatory Services (S Addy) and Democratic Services Officer (E Brown)

Others: Councillor Smith

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM

The Director of Environment advised that the Chairman, Councillor Ferguson, was still recovering from a recent spell in hospital and would therefore not be in attendance to chair the meeting.

He further advised that the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, was also unwell and was therefore unable to assume the Chair on this occasion.

Councillor Cathcart then proposed, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the former Chairman, Councillor Martin, be nominated pro tem.

Councillor Martin duly assumed the Chair. He noted the Committee’s best wishes to Councillor Ferguson for a speedy recovery.

NOTED.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Ferguson, Councillor Armstrong-Cotter and Alderman Henry.

NOTED.
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman, Councillor Martin, sought any declarations of interest and none were advised at this stage in the meeting.

**NOTED.**

3. **ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT – JULY 2018 (FILE FIN45)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 28 August 2018 from the Director of Environment stating that the Environment Budgetary Control Report covered the 4-month period 1 April to 31 July 2018 and was set out below. The net cost of services was showing an over spend of £36,622 (0.6%).

**Explanation of Variance**

In addition, a Budgetary Control Report by Income and Expenditure for the Directorate was also shown on below which analysed the overall adverse variance (£36,622) by expenditure (£14,549 favourable) and income (£51,171 adverse).

**ENVIRONMENT**

**Expenditure - £14.5k (0.2%) better than budget to date.** This favourable variance was mainly made up of the following: -

1. Waste and Cleansing Services - £20.1k favourable.
   a. A combined summary of the main waste stream variances was set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£’000</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.2k tonnes more than budget though gate fee slightly less than budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Green bin waste</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.2k tonnes more than budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue bin waste</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.3k tonnes less than budget but gate fee is higher than budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC waste</td>
<td>(18.9)</td>
<td>Lower tonnage than budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the main waste stream budgets were showing an adverse variance of £21.5k.

b. Payroll costs were £62.4k favourable to date. There were a significant number of posts being covered by agency.

c. Street sweepings were £5.9k over budget to date.

d. Waste haulage costs were £10.0k over budget to date.

2. **Assets and Property Services - £37.2k adverse.** This was explained by: -
a. Property Operations were £31.7k over budget to date. That was mainly due to: -
   i. Payroll costs were £10.4k favourable mainly due to overtime being £8.8k under budget to date.
   ii. Contractor costs were £44.1k over budget to date. There had been more planned and reactive property maintenance carried out to date.

b. Technical Services were £12.7k under budget to date. This was mainly due to: -
   i. Payroll costs were £5.9k favourable mainly due to vacant posts which were currently being covered by agency.
   ii. Utility costs were £43.3k under budget to date.
   iii. Contractor costs were £36.7k over budget to date. This covered areas such as statutory compliance work, refurbishments, playgrounds, statutory upgrades and energy saving initiatives.

c. Fleet Management was £25.3k over budget to date. This was mainly due to: -
   i. Payroll costs were £12.0k. There was a vacant mechanic’s post which was in the process of being filled.
   ii. Vehicle maintenance and tyres costs were £20.1k over budget to date.
   iii. Vehicle fuel, lubricants and oil were £16.7k over budget to date.

3. Regulatory Services - £33.1k favourable. This was explained by: -
   a. Payroll costs were £28.8k under budget year to date. There was a vacant post in Building Control which was in the process of being filled. In addition, 2 vacant posts in Neighbourhood Environment Team were now being covered by agency.

Income - £51.2k (3.3%) worse than budget to date. This adverse variance comprised:

4. Waste & Cleansing Services - £25.9k adverse. This was mainly due to trade waste income (£26.8k) being worse than budget to date.

5. Assets and Property Services - £11.8k favourable. Harbour berthing fee income (£7.3k) and wind turbine income (£5.4k) were better than budget to date.

6. Regulatory Services income - £37.1k adverse. This was mainly due to Building Control income (£30.0k), Property Certificate income (£2.8k) and Car Park income (£8.0k) being behind budget to date.
Referring to the table of main waste stream variances, Councillor Cathcart sought further clarity on the overspend in respect of blue bin waste.

The Director explained that both landfill and blue bin waste incurred a gate fee, however the contract price for blue bin waste had increase by £10 per ton, in-year. This was due to a number of factors which included a fall in the market value of blue bin recyclable waste streams.

Councillor Woods referred to item 1b in the report and queried the number of posts being covered by agency staff.

In response, the Director advised that currently there were approximately 40-50 posts being covered by agency staff. He further advised that the Council had agreed a transformation programme for Borough Cleansing Services and so the process of filling posts had commenced. He stated that in the coming months there
should be a significant change in the current position with regard to deployment of Agency staff.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Boyle, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the recommendation be adopted.

4. **NORTHERN IRELAND LOCAL AUTHORITY MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STATISTICS, JANUARY – MARCH 2018 (FILE 53042)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Environment stating that the official waste management statistics for the fourth quarter of 2017/18 (January to March 2018) had recently been released by the Northern Ireland Environment Agency.

The significant headlines contained within this report showed that:

i. The Council’s Household waste recycling rate had risen by a further 3.3% compared to Q4 the previous year, from 45% to 48.2%. The Q4 household recycling rate was now 11% higher than it had been in the strategy baseline year of 2015/16, compared to a NI wide rise of just 5.3% over the same period.

![Household Waste Recycling Rate Trends Quarter 4 - January to March](image)

ii. The Council’s household waste recycling rate of 48.2% had been 4.6% higher than the NI average of 43.6%.

iii. The Council had moved from a ranking of 3rd place to 2nd place out of the 11 NI Councils for its household waste recycling rate.
iv. The Council’s household waste composting rate rose by a further 0.6% - from 22.9% to 23.5%, whilst household waste dry recycling rate had risen more significantly by 2.5% - from 22% to 24.5%.

v. The Council’s household waste composting rate of 23.5% had been 5.7% higher than the NI average of 17.8%.

vi. The Council’s household waste dry recycling rate (i.e. recycling of items other than organic food and garden waste) of 24.5% had been 1.2% lower than the N.I. average of 25.7%.

vii. The Council’s kerbside recycling capture rate of 64.2% for household compostable waste materials had still been far in excess of the NI Council average of 46.1%.

viii. The Council remained the highest performing council in relation to household waste composting rate.

ix. The Council was still at the lower end of the performance table for ‘dry’ recycling rate, ranking 9th out of 11 Councils.

x. The Council had received 19.6% more waste per capita at its HRCs compared to the average for other NI Councils, however this was a significant decrease from the 31% excess waste handled at the sites over the same period the previous year. This was a reflection of the impact of the new access permit system for vans and trailers entering HRCs, which had been introduced during that reporting period.

xi. Despite the significant fall in the overall amount of waste handled at the Council’s HRCs, the recycling rate at those sites remained significantly lower than the average for other Councils – 51.2%, compared to an average rate of 62% for other Councils. This reflected the fact that too many site users were still using HRCs to ‘dump’ rather than ‘recycle’; as agreed by the Council in June, a package of measures would be introduced in coming months aimed at significantly boosting HRC recycling performance.

This latest official Municipal Waste Management Statistics report provided continuing encouragement and further firm evidence of significant sustained success in the implementation of the Council’s Sustainable Waste Resource Management Strategy. Importantly, it also helped us to focus on issues of key significance for further recycling advancements. The Council was clearly still performing relatively poorly on ‘dry’ recycling, i.e. recycling of waste items that should be going into blue bins and into relevant recycling containers at HRCs.

This was the final quarter report for the 2017/18 reporting year, and the Council’s provisional annual household waste recycling rate for that year was estimated at 52.1% - to be officially confirmed later in the year when the annual 2017/18 report was issued by the NIEA. This compared to a rate of 40.2% in the Council’s Strategy baseline year of 2015/16; an 11.9% rise in just two years, equating to approximately 10,000 tons of extra waste material being recycled rather than being landfilled each
year. The provisional 2017/18 household waste recycling rate of 52.1% compared to a provisional annual rate of 48.3% for all NI Councils. By way of comparison of the Council’s recycling progress with other Councils following LGR, the NI Council average rise in household waste recycling rates had been just 6.1% compared to the Council’s 11.9% increase.

Areas of focus over the coming few months in pursuit of further recycling gains, would include:

- Reform Trade Waste service model to promote recycling.
- Implementation of on-site measures to enhance recycling outcomes at HRCs.
- Promotion of greater/more universal use of the new glass recycling boxes.
- Further promotion of much more comprehensive use of the blue bin for the full range of dry recyclable waste items.
- Further promotion of food waste recycling in the green/brown bin.

Progress towards the key targets set out in our Strategy was summarised and illustrated in the following charts.
RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

Councillor Dunlop commented that some of the figures were excellent whilst others were not so great and she queried why the Council was lagging behind the rest of the Councils in Northern Ireland in those areas.

In response, the Director advised that in the first instance, the Council had moved to be the second highest overall out of the 11 NI Councils for its household waste
recycling rate. Furthermore, during the previous two years, the Council had achieved a 12% increase in its household waste recycling rate, which was double the Northern Ireland Council average of 6%. He noted that there were two elements to consider: firstly, that the Council was well ahead of the national average composting rate – due largely to its exceptional performance on recycling of food waste. Secondly, the dry recyclable rate was a more complex matter comprising two main factors: materials brought to household recycling centres and blue bins collected at the kerbside. He acknowledged that the dry recyclable rate was lower than it should be and emphasised that the Council needed to do better on that front.

A number of measures were ongoing to address that, and the good news was that at last the Council’s ‘dry’ recycling rate had begun to rise, from being stubbornly static over the past couple of years. He reported that a composition analysis of grey bin waste had been conducted which had revealed that a high level of waste placed in grey bins should in fact be going into blue bins. In addition, many people were inappropriately using the landfill skips at the HRCs instead of sorting their waste into the correct skips for recycling. Our HRC recycling rate in particular, was currently well below the NI Council average.

Councillor Dunlop asked whether staff prevented people from using the wrong skips and the Director advised that a project team had been established to look at this and other related issues at HRCs. He continued that staff would be drawing up a comprehensive plan to promote a greater culture of ‘recycling’ at HRCs, including the type of engagement with site users, site layout and infrastructure.

Councillor Cathcart believed it was a great testament to the people of the Borough to see this increase in recycling rates and he hoped that trend would continue. He considered that a very clear and positive message of encouragement needed to be sent out to residents about the achievements so far, and the potential for further recycling gains which would further help to save ratepayers’ money.

(Councillor Smart left the meeting at this stage – 7.20pm)

Councillor Cathcart requested that future reports included a breakdown of waste received in HRCs compared to other NI Councils and the Director confirmed that could be done in the future.

Alderman Fletcher described how his grey bin had received a yellow warning sticker after him placing water and honey soaked newspaper in it, which he had understood would not be suitable for the blue or brown bins. He was delighted that this material could be recycled in the brown bin, but he believed there was room for the public to be better informed about what other materials were fit to go in the different recycling bins.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Edmund, that the recommendation be adopted.**
5. **BUSINESS PLAN QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT – WASTE AND CLEANSING SERVICES**  
(Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 22 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above and attaching the report for the first Quarter of 2018/19.

**Context**

The Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil this requirement, the Council had approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2017/18 plan published 15 June 2017)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2017)

The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key achievements:**

- Sustained improvement in the Council’s household recycling and composting rate (provisional Q1 estimate of 55%, up from 52.3% in Q1 last year). 60% was the annual target for 2018-19 and progress towards this would not be known until year end.
Emerging issues:

- Progress towards further improvement of the Council’s LEAMs score would be dependent upon implementation of its agreed new Borough Cleansing Services model and improved outcomes highlighted at its recent service model review report.

Action to be taken:

- Continue with implementation of our Sustainable Waste Resource Management Strategy measures and new Borough Cleansing Services model.
- Focus upon consistent and robust implementation of staff absence management protocols.
- Staff satisfaction survey to be completed.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Dunlop, seconded by Councillor Boyle, that the recommendation be adopted.

6. QUARTER 1 BUSINESS PLAN PERFORMANCE REPORT – REGULATORY SERVICES (FILE 43600) (Appendix II)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 16 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above and attaching the report for the first Quarter of 2018/19.

Context

The Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil this requirement, the Council had approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2017/18 plan published 15 June 2017)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2017)

The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.
Reporting approach

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key points to note:

- KPI’s developed for car parking had been made with the presumption that the car park strategy would be in place. As a result, the forecasted increase in revenue associated with promotion of ‘Parkmobile’ was now inaccurate.
- A range of measures were proposed in forthcoming service model reviews for both Borough Cleansing Services and the Neighbourhood Environment Team that were aimed at achieving a sustained rise in the LEAMS score.

Key achievements:

- There had been a high level of staff turnover due to sickness, career moves, retirement and career breaks. Despite this Regulatory Services had successfully managed to meet the staff absentee target.

Emerging issues:

- Currently there was a lack of standardisation across various Regulatory Services. This made collective measurement of performance/service outcomes more difficult.

Action to be taken:

- Managers within the service were working with our software provider to explore standardising online capabilities such as service satisfaction surveys.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Cummings, seconded by Councillor Edmund, that the recommendation be adopted.

7. GOVERNANCE AT HARBOURS – DESIGNATED PERSON ROLE (FILE 65373)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 20 July 2018 from the Director of Environment stating that in December 2017 a report had been tabled identifying the various governance roles at the Council’s Harbours in order to comply with the recommendations laid out in the Port Marine Safety Code 2016 (PMSC).
The Council had agreed that it would be formally designated as the “Harbour Authority”, with the Council (acting through the Environment Committee) also fulfilling the role of “Duty Holder” under the PMSC. It had also been agreed that “a suitably qualified and experienced contractor be appointed as the Designated Person, to be confirmed through a subsequent report to Council.”

To recap, the “designated person” provided independent assurance directly to the duty holder that the Marine Safety Management System (MSMS), for which the duty holder was responsible, was working effectively. Their main responsibility was to determine, through assessment and audit, the effectiveness of the MSMS in ensuring compliance with the Code.

In order to fulfil this function, the designated person had to have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the requirements of this Code (and supporting Guide to Good Practice) and associated port and marine legislation. Their role did not obscure the accountability of the duty holder.

Further to the December 2017 report on the matter, officers were then proposing that the Harbour Master of Bangor Marina and Harbour, Kevin Baird, be appointed to fulfil the role of our Designated Person.

Kevin had over 30 years’ experience in working in the marine industry and possesses numerous qualifications in both marine and Health and Safety subjects. He had much local knowledge having worked at Bangor Marina since its opening, and on fishing vessels prior to that. He was therefore ideally placed to offer expert independent advice and oversight in this role.

The Designated Person would determine, through assessment and audit whether the individual elements of the MSMS met the specific requirements of the PMSC.

The assessment and audit process would include:

1. Monitoring and auditing the thoroughness of the risk assessment process and the validity of the assessment conclusions.
2. Monitoring and auditing the thoroughness of the incident investigation process and the validity of the investigation conclusions.
3. Monitoring the application of lessons learnt from individual and industry experience and incident investigation.
4. Assessing and auditing the validity and effectiveness of indicators used to measure performance against the requirements and standards in the Code.
5. Assessing the validity and effectiveness of consultation processes used to involve and secure the commitment of all appropriate stakeholders.

As laid out in the PMSC, the Designated Person would report his findings on the effectiveness of the MSMS directly to the Duty Holder. This would take place in the form of an annual presentation to the Environment Committee.
It was proposed that Kevin and his team at Quay Marinas would also provide ongoing assistance with the Council’s Local Lighthouse Authority obligations under the Merchant Shipping Acts (RoI and NI) and the Port Marine Safety Code.

All Local Aids to Navigation (AtoNs) under the control of Council were audited once per year by Commissioners of Irish Lights (CIL).

Using their existing 24/7 helpdesk at Bangor Marina, Kevin’s team would provide a central point of contact for reporting Local AtoN failures. Furthermore, they would submit quarterly availability reports to CIL on all Local AtoNs under the Council’s remit.

RECOMMENDED that Kevin Baird of Quay Marinas be formally appointed to fulfil the role of Designated Person for Council Harbours at Groomsport, Donaghadee, Ballywalter, Ballyhalbert and Cook St Portaferry and also to provide assistance to the Council in regard to its obligations in regard to Local Aids to Navigation.

Welcoming the report, Councillor Edmund believed the appointment would give the Council more flexibility and control over the five harbours. He thanked officers for their work in getting to this point.

Alderman Fletcher sought clarity on whether the role attracted additional remuneration and the Head of Assets and Property Services advised that it was a relatively small fee, which was below procurement limits. He noted that this represented good value for money.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Edmund, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the recommendation be adopted.

8. PERFORMANCE REPORT – NEIGHBOURHOOD ENVIRONMENT TEAM (FILE 92009)
(Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 16 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above and attaching Fixed Penalty Notice Locations by month.

1.0 Introduction

The information provided in the report covered, unless otherwise stated, the period 1 March 2018 to 31 July 2018. The aim of the report was to provide details of some of the key activities of the Team, the range of services it provided along with details of level of performance.

2.0 Prosecutions

A 500% increase in the number of fixed penalties issued over the previous two years and continued high levels of fixed penalty issue had resulted in a backlog of court files.
The following cases were in preparation or awaiting a Court hearing. An additional administrative assistant was due to commence employment in September 2018 in order to add to the team’s case preparation capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Dog Licence</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fouling</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straying</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littering</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to provide information Art 20 (Litter)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Attack on Livestock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal against control conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Attack on person</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0 Fixed Penalty Notices Issued

In addition to cases being prosecuted through the court as detailed above, 567 fixed penalties had been issued in respect of various matters. This continued to demonstrate a sustained Council focus upon detecting and punishing those who persisted in committing environmental offences in the Borough.

The following graphs demonstrated:

1. the total number of fixed penalties issued by the Neighbourhood Environment Team each month since April 2016,
2. the fixed penalties issued during the period of report by type and
3. the fixed penalties issued during the period of report by location.
4.0 Dog Licences

In the period March to July 2018, a total of 6,406 dog licences had been issued.

5.0 Service Requests

The Neighbourhood Environment Team had received 1,435 requests for service between 1 March and 31 July 2018 in the following categories.
6.0 Customer Satisfaction Surveys

Following completion of a service request, a customer satisfaction survey was often issued, of which 61 had been returned. A summary of percentage level of satisfaction from those 61 returns against key questions was provided below. The key questions sought information on the customer’s level of satisfaction around:

Customer Service

- Quality of Service
- Courteousness and professionalism
- Kept informed

Scoring 73%

Service Request Outcome

- Resolving the issue
- Meeting expectations
- Timeliness of response

Scoring 68%

The satisfaction rates reflect the ongoing challenges around workload and staffing levels.

7.0 Staffing Levels

The Neighbourhood Environment Team had faced significant challenges, particularly over the summer holiday period, due to the departure of two Neighbourhood Environment Officers coinciding with the pre-booked annual leave of remaining officers. One officer had left on a temporary secondment and one on a career break. Additionally, the team had been awaiting the recruitment of a replacement Administrative Assistant since May 2018. Key officers had agreed to defer annual leave in order to maintain a satisfactory level of staffing over the summer period.

8.0 Education/Promotional Campaigns

Over the previous five-month period the Neighbourhood Environment Team had supported a range of groups which undertook litter clean ups within the Borough.

- North Down and Ards Beach Cleaners on five occasions
- Thriving Life Church
- Donaghadee Community Development Group
- PWC staff litter pick
- Police Rehabilitation and Retraining Trust

Those along with several other ad hoc groups had contributed to the removal of over 350 bags of litter from the beaches and open spaces around the Borough.
9.0 Kennel Club Good Citizen Dog Training

During March 2018 the Neighbourhood Environment Team had delivered the Kennel Club’s Good Citizen Dog training classes. Pictured here were some “graduates” from the Spring classes.

9.1 The Kennel Club Bronze Award and Kennel Club Puppy Foundation

Classes were now planned to commence on Wednesday 19 September 2018 in the Queens Hall, Newtownards, at 7pm. They would run on the following dates: 19 September, 3 October, 10 October, 17 October, 24 October, 7 November and 14 November 2018.

The puppy class was for dogs between 3 months and 6 months old. The charge would be £25.00 for all 7 classes.

The Bronze Award was for dogs from 6 months onwards. The charge would be £35.00 for all 7 classes.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

Praising the work of officers, Councillor Cathcart stressed the importance of increasing public awareness as there was a public perception that the Council did not do anything about problems with dog fouling and other such environmental control issues. He encouraged working with the Corporate Communications team in that regard to show that they were miles ahead of other Councils in terms of enforcement against offenders. He congratulated the team for a job well done.
Councillor Woods thanked officers and staff for their fantastic work.

Councillor Dunlop raised a query about repeat offenders and the Head of Regulatory Services advised that several re-offenders had been identified and officers had made the Courts aware. He further advised that a penalty was issued on the first offence and then a subsequent offence resulted in a Court appearance.

Councillor Douglas referred to the publication of the LEAMS Report which indicated that the Council was at the bottom or next to the bottom of the league table in respect of street cleanliness. She wondered what lessons could be learnt from the more successful Councils in addressing the problem of dog fouling.

In response, the Head of Regulatory Services advised that enforcement was clearly not the only way to tackle the problem, rather that it also involved education, and working with cleansing services and using other cross departmental working to fully address the matter. He believed that adopting the Council’s present integrated strategy approach would ultimately bear fruit in terms of raising the quality of the local environment, and that direction of travel was most likely to result in sustainable, long term improvement; however, it would inevitably take some time before key performance indicators started to reflect and show this.

(Councillor Smart returned to the meeting at this stage – 7.31pm)

Referring to Item 5.0 – Service Requests – Alderman Fletcher commented that there had been 77 incidents of dog attacks recorded in a five-month period. He wondered if that should be highlighted given the horrendous nature of such attacks.

To provide some context, the Head of Regulatory Services clarified that the experience of an ‘attack’ was subjective, meaning that if a person felt threatened or fearful of an attack, that would be classed as an attack in legal terms. Attacks were categorized from minor to serious. He advised that it was difficult to define the percentage of minor or major attacks given that they were all subjective.

Councillor Boyle questioned whether a blanket approach was the best way to tackle problems of dog fouling and other issues. He reported that an 80-year-old lady had been issued with a penalty for her dog’s mess, when in reality she simply could not remember where her dog had fouled.

In response, the Head of Regulatory Services advised that whilst officers were encouraged to use their discretion, given the number of excuses they were routinely given by almost everyone they challenged, it was standard procedure to adopt a ‘zero’ tolerance approach and issue a fixed penalty where there was clear evidence that an offence had been committed. Clearly, where there are ‘exceptional’ circumstances, officers were permitted to exercise discretion in regard to the issue of a fixed penalty.

At this stage, the Director advised that he had worked for a time in various realms of Environmental Health enforcement and could fully appreciate the difficult circumstances faced by officers on the ground. He noted that the Council had adopted a zero tolerance approach in respect of dog fouling and littering in the
context of their significant impact on the environment and local amenity, and he reiterated that officers were routinely given a plethora of excuses by offenders in a bid to avoid being fined. He considered that the Council’s robust approach acted as a deterrent and it was hoped that over time it would lead to a reduction in dog fouling and contribute to improving the cleanliness of the Borough’s streets and other public spaces.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the recommendation be adopted.

9. DEVELOPMENT OF OFF STREET CAR PARKING STRATEGY – UPDATE REPORT (FILE 90303)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 22 August 2018 from the Director of Environment stating that the development of a draft Off Street Car Park Strategy had been ongoing over recent months. At the Council meeting in July it had been agreed that 11 nominated Members would form a Car Park Strategy Working Group to liaise with officers, with a view to moving towards finalisation of a draft strategy document that could be agreed by the Council for formal public consultation.

Officers had now arranged an initial meeting of the Member Working Group, scheduled for 19 September 2018, and this would be used to review the strategy development process to date and assess any potential areas for refinement of the current draft document. The Committee would be updated in due course with regard to further strategy development progress.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

Councillor Boyle advised that Councillor Menagh had been nominated but was not available to attend and therefore he would be attending in his place.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Boyle, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the recommendation be adopted.

10. LIVE HERE LOVE HERE SMALL GRANTS SCHEME 18/19 – GRANT ALLOCATIONS (FILE 92017) (Appendix IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 1 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above and attaching a list of the groups offered funding and a summary of their planned projects.

1.0 Introduction

In March 2018 the Council had agreed to maintain an enhanced level of funding from the Recycling Community Investment Fund for the 2018-19 Live Here Love Here Small Grants Scheme, administered and promoted by the Council in partnership with Keep Northern Ireland Beautiful. Following a high profile launch of that year’s scheme, 23 local organisations/groups from across the Borough had been awarded
funding and were presently developing and implementing the projects described. It was anticipated that the projects would be completed in the spring of 2019 following which further publicity would be sought to ensure that the important link between the savings secured through the public’s recycling engagement and local environmental improvement projects, was highlighted.

The agreed budget for that year’s LHLH Small Grants Scheme was £75K.

2.0 Community and Environmental Improvement Projects

In total 26 groups had applied for funding for a diverse range of projects, the overall amount requested by applicants totalling £77,722. The total grant amount awarded had been £57,850, as elements of some proposed projects could not be funded because they did not meet the full criteria. After accounting for the administration fee payable to Keep Northern Ireland Beautiful for its administration of the grants on the Council’s behalf, it was anticipated that there would be a small underspend and it was planned that this would be used to organise a range of PR events aimed at promoting and encouraging environmental good practice generally across communities. Details of that were yet to be finalised.

Those projects represented a wide spread of community and environmental development initiatives, involving a wide demographic and geographic cross-section of the communities across the Borough. Officers would be working to ensure that Live Here Love Here Small Grant recipient groups were fully aware that the funding they were receiving was attributable to sustained improvements in their communities’ engagement in household recycling. This fact, and the RCIF branding would feature heavily in the communications and publicity surrounding each project.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

Welcoming the report, Councillor Douglas was delighted to see the diversity of the projects making bids for funding. She asked what the remaining £20,000 would be spent on.

In response, the Head of Regulatory Services advised that it was vital to have cross departmental discussions in order to put forward the appropriate projects and ensure the money was spent in the most productive manner. He believed that some expenditure of the balance on improved promotion of the RCIF was also needed to get the message out to the residents of the Borough about the financial benefits of maintaining and further improving the Council’s recycling performance.

Rising in support, Councillor Cathcart paid tribute to those involved in the Open House Festival for its project. Referring also to the planned project ‘Regeneration of old Bangor Bathing Pool’, he expressed concern about the risk of liability as the area was not designed as a bathing area and he wanted to ensure that the Council would not be held liable for any problems arising.

The Head of Regulatory Services stressed the importance of all projects getting the green light in terms of finance, at that stage - and then any other practical/implementation issues could be properly explored. He advised that he was
meeting with Team Splash and Dash the following day and all assistance would be provided to help them to help get the project delivered where possible. He further advised that DEARA would be assessing the area to establish whether the area was safe to bathe in.

Welcoming the report, Councillor Edmund was impressed with the diversity of the proposed projects. He was delighted to discover what the public had achieved through their recycling efforts and to have some of the money saved put back into the community in this way was fantastic. He believed it would speak volumes to groups on the ground.

Referring to the Bee Bomb Bank, Alderman Fletcher queried the efficiency of the bee bombs and whether there were more effective ways to create wild flower meadows on a bigger scale. The Head of Regulatory Services responded that it was a community led initiative and therefore the group had come to them with the project they wanted to deliver. The symbolism of the bee bombs may well lead to greater public awareness and wider action on wild flower planting/preservation.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Douglas, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the recommendation be adopted.

11. EVALUATION REPORT RE: SCOOP THE POOP ANTI-DOG FOULING CAMPAIGN (FILE 92011) (Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 16 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above and attaching a summary of the social media campaign activities and outcomes.

1.0 Introduction – ‘Scoop that Poop’ Campaign

A major campaign to address dog fouling in public places had been held throughout the Borough between 2 January 2018 until 31 March 2018. This issue was widely recognised as being one of significant community concern, with ongoing calls for more focus to be placed by the Council and other stakeholders on reducing the problem of dog waste not being lifted and placed in bins by pet owners. The campaign had been recognised by the Council as one that would meet the aims of the Recycling Community Investment Fund, and it was therefore part-funded as agreed, from that newly established financial resource (in the amount of £12,335).

2.0 Campaign Planning

A cross-directorate working group had met in December 2017 to examine the potential for planning and executing an effective high-profile campaign around the theme of dog fouling in public places.

The Neighbourhood Environment Team (NET) had reported that an estimated 40% of its workload had been related to dog fouling complaints/control and that significant public concern existed around health issues and other detrimental effects of dog fouling that was left in public places rather than being lifted by pet owners and
discarded in bins. It had been noted that other sections including cleansing and parks had also contributed significant resources towards dealing with dog waste left lying in public places.

The project steering group consisted of:

- Director of Environment
- Head of Regulatory Services
- Neighbourhood Environment Services Manager
- Neighbourhood Environment Services Supervisor
- Borough Cleansing Manager
- Parks and Cemeteries Manager
- Corporate Communications Officers

2.1 Key Elements of the Campaign

The following key elements were agreed:

- Dedicating 1392 hours to enforcement patrols during the campaign
- £30,000 budget with half provided by the Recycling Community Investment Fund
- Social Media Campaign
- Cinema advertising
- Ad shell advertising
- Banners and localised information boards
- Shopping Centre help desks
- Posters and flyers at Council facilities etc.
- Free poop bag promotion
- Independent assessment of cleanliness of key problem dog fouling areas before, during and after the campaign.

3.0 Campaign Delivery

3.1 Key Messages

The steering group had been keen to have a clear focused communications approach, targeting both dog walkers/owners and witnesses to dog fouling offences. The campaign had centred on the need for greater awareness of the fact that when walking a dog, one must properly supervise, pick up any dog waste and bin it. The added element to the campaign had been aimed at witnesses and encouraged the reporting of dog fouling offences with meaningful, timely and useful information.

3.2 Enforcement Patrols

The increased level of enforcement patrols during the 3-month period of the campaign had seen a 222% increase in fixed penalties issued for dog fouling compared to the same period the previous year. This had been despite the fact that detection of offences/gathering suitable evidence, was more difficult during the
darker evening/morning dog walking periods and the routine level of enforcement patrolling was normally reduced during the winter period to reflect this.

![Dog Fouling Fixed Penalty Notices Issued](image)

**3.3 Communications Campaign**

The “Scoop that Poop” branding had been utilised throughout the campaign and every litter bin was provided with the “dog poo welcome here” sticker to encourage use for that purpose.

Video clips had been produced to deliver the campaign message both in local cinemas and on social media. An example can be viewed online at:
Scoop that Poop Video clip [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M5772qn8DiQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M5772qn8DiQ)

This campaign had been launched on Facebook on 8 January 2018 via the Scoop That Poop video. This initial post had a ‘reach’ of 55,000 people (number of unique people who saw the content in their newsfeed). This had resulted in almost 21,000 video views and the video had been shared 129 times, with a significant number of comments on the page. Overall, the number of reactions/comments/shares had reached 921.

In addition to localised enforcement, localised information boards had been provided in each hotspot area and those included the financial value of fines issued in the previous 12 months; the inference being that if a person allowed their dog to foul and did not pick up they stood a very real chance of being caught and punished financially. The following graphic was an example of the information boards utilised.

3.4 Reporting of Offences

The Council’s communications campaign did lead to an increased level of offence reporting. However, the quality of reporting had tended to be nonspecific in nature and whilst it had contributed to their knowledge of “hotspot areas”, disappointingly it did not assist with enforcement in relation to ‘specific’ offences to any great extent. This had highlighted the ongoing enforcement challenge, that whilst many members of the public were exercised enough about the problem of dog fouling in public places to complain about it in general terms, there was a reluctance to provide specific intelligence (e.g. days/times/locations/dog and owner details) that would facilitate detection of offences and enforcement against particular offenders.
3.4.1 Online Reporting of Dog Fouling Offences

As part of the Council’s communications campaign, an online reporting facility had been developed, allowing members of the public to confidentially go onto the Council’s web site and complete a proforma with relevant details deemed necessary to facilitate more productive allocation of investigative resources, i.e. enhancing the chances of detection and punishment of offenders. This had been something that had been specifically suggested by some Elected Members and had been considered by officers as being a potentially important aspect of their enforcement protocol. The link to the relevant part of the web site was shown below.


Unfortunately, this initiative had limited impact, resulting in 93 reports throughout the course of 3-month campaign itself (with a total of 113 reports over the previous 7 months since the facility went live). Again however, the information provided had been not generally specific enough to greatly enhance enforcement outcomes and it was estimated that it had not assisted in any directly related offence detections.

4.0 Cleanliness Monitoring

Independent monitoring of identified “fouling hotspots” within the Borough had been carried out by Keep NI Beautiful. The purpose had been to establish a baseline measurement of dog fouling instances prior to the campaign, again during and then after the campaign. The results of 4 surveys undertaken were provided below.

### Individual “Dog Fouling Hotspot” Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Winter 2017</th>
<th>Mid March 2018</th>
<th>End of April 2018</th>
<th>Total Fouls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fouls</td>
<td>Smears</td>
<td>Bags</td>
<td>Fouls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownards</td>
<td>East Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownards</td>
<td>Movilla Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownards</td>
<td>Floodgates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comber</td>
<td>Island Hill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comber</td>
<td>Dunsey Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Seadiff Rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Ballyholme Prom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Ballymacage School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Castle Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Train station</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Marine Gardens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Stricklands Glen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Carnalea path</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen’s Bay</td>
<td>Chimera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holywood</td>
<td>Seapark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holywood</td>
<td>Lady’s Mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groomsport</td>
<td>Harbour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaghadee</td>
<td>The Parade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaghadee</td>
<td>The Commons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millisle</td>
<td>Beach Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballyhalbert</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portavogie</td>
<td>Harbour Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloughy</td>
<td>The Warren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portaferry</td>
<td>Football pitch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kircubbin</td>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Borough-Wide Results

It was pleasing to note the significant reduction in dog waste found at the identified hotspot areas between the pre-campaign measurement (December 2017) and the during campaign point (March 2018) and the sustained level until the end of April 2018.

Officers were currently reviewing options for transformation of the service model and staffing structure for the NET - aimed at delivering enhanced outcomes, more efficiently. As indicated in the report, a significant proportion of the NET’s work related to dog control and tackling the issue of dog fouling in public places. It was officers’ intention to take on board the outcomes from the ‘Scoop That Poop’ campaign and the lessons learned, when proposing a new service model for approval by Members. For example, further work on elements of the campaign that may have potential to deliver sustained or further beneficial impacts on dog fouling control; where deemed appropriate officers would look at the most efficient ways of incorporating those into the routine service delivery model/protocols for the Neighbourhood Environment Team.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

Councillor Douglas expressed her disappointment at the report, given that an accountability framework had been established but which had unfortunately appeared to have had little impact. She welcomed the inclusion of other measures to tackle the problem of dog fouling. She stressed the importance of contextualising where the Council was in relation to other Councils. She sought clarity on the targets the Council was setting itself and what were the lessons that could be learnt.
Going forward she would like to see a harder hitting approach especially in respect of health and safety factors and she asked that this be given consideration.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Edmund, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the recommendation be adopted.

12. **RCIF UNDERSPEND 2017-18 (FILE 69001)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 9 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above.

1.0 **Introduction**

2017/2018 had been the first year that the Recycling Community Investment Fund (RCIF) was established, using a proportion of the significant savings accruing from residents’ engagement with the Council in relation to its transformed recycling services. £200,000 had been made available through this for projects that should be designed to reward and incentivise local communities to continue with and further improve upon their recycling practices.

Within that short timeframe and limited resources, 3 major projects had been designed and implemented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Actual Spend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Here Love Here Small Grants Scheme</td>
<td>£76623.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR Schools Environmental Education Scheme</td>
<td>£28192.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop that Poop Campaign</td>
<td>£12335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>£90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£117840.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of those projects had been/were being evaluated and reported on separately. In summary however, they each had their own very positive outcomes and had been extremely successful in achieving their targets. Over the past year, officers had gone beyond their routine/standard duties and risen to the challenge of designing and utilising the new RCIF to deliver value adding outcomes for communities across the Borough.

During 2017/18, the first year of the establishment of the RCIF, there had been an inevitable initial period of ground work required to get deployment of the Fund off the starting blocks. This lead-in period and the need to identify and prioritise relevant staff resource, had resulted in the RCIF budget being underspent the previous year by the sum of £82159.10.

2.0 **Proposals for 2017/18 RCIF Underspend**

In the circumstances it was proposed that this underspend should be earmarked for expenditure on relevant projects aligned to the principles of the RCIF, in the current financial year. A cross departmental team of officers had reviewed options for the most beneficial deployment of the underspend and the table below summarised a
range of project proposals that would provide a wide range of community/environmental benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10 x Sea Bins</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>35 x Gum Bins</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>35 x Ballot Bins</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Compostable Straws for Local Businesses</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14 x School Litter Packs</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10 x 2 Min. Beach Clean Boards</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Summer Scheme Event</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10 x RCIF Branded Igloo Recycling Banks</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>RCIF Promotional</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These projects were diverse; however, they had common themes which aligned with the stated objectives of the RCIF:

Common Themes:

- Specifically target common litter problems that had significant adverse impact on the amenity and attractiveness of the Borough.
- Relatively unique and ‘headline’ grabbing.
- Extremely ‘on point’ with recent increased awareness of litter, single use plastics, marine pollution etc.
- Go above and beyond Council baseline service obligations and could be promoted as value adding community benefit schemes that give ‘payback’ for residents’ recycling efforts.
- Demonstrate Council commitment at tackling the big issues that threatened both local and global environmental well-being.

The cross departmental group involving officers from

- Neighbourhood Environment Team
- Recycling Team
- Parks Team
- Licensing Team
- Bio-diversity Officer
- Community Safety Team and
- Community Development Team,

agreed that, whilst the proposal had involved a large number of proposed projects they had common themes and were achievable given that each project did not require significant officer hours. Below was a brief description of each project:
3.0 Project Details

3.1 10 x Sea Bins

Tackling: Plastics and Micro Plastics in the sea.
Problem: No explanation of that huge problem required.
Solution: The Sea bin was a floating rubbish bin that was located in the water at marinas, docks, yacht clubs and commercial ports.

The Sea bin moved up and down with the range of tide collecting all floating rubbish. Water was sucked in from the surface and passed through a catch bag inside the Sea bin. The water was then pumped back into the marina leaving litter and debris trapped in the catch bag to be disposed of properly. The Sea bin could catch an estimated 1.5 Kgs of floating debris per day including micro-plastics up to 2 mm small. The intention was to place those in strategic locations in local harbours.

3.2 35 x Gum Bins

Tackling: Chewing gum deposited on the streets.
Problem: Particularly outside nightlife hotspots chewing gum covered the footpaths, it looked terrible, was unhygienic and difficult and expensive to remove as well as being harmful to animals.
Solution: Distributed in partnership with local businesses to 35 targeted areas, the Gumdrop had proved to reduce chewing gum litter by up to 46% in the first 12 weeks of use and could save as much as £18000 per annum on cleaning bills. It was a
great addition to CSR goals and a product that has captured the public’s imagination. They were small gum bins that were made out of gum. When they were filled the company collected them and recycle the collected gum into new gum bins.

3.3 35 x ‘Ballot’ Bins

Tackling: Littering of Cigarette Butts
Problem: Looked untidy, unhygienic, unhealthy, harmed wildlife, most littered item in the Borough.
Solution: The Ballot Bin was a customizable ashtray proven to reduce cigarette butt litter.
Each Ballot Bin displayed a question and two answers. Smokers voted by putting their cigarette butt in the slots underneath their preferred answer. The litter stacked up behind the clear glass front in two columns, showing which answer was most popular.

The questions could be easily changed by the Ballot Bin owner. They could be funny, topical, provocative – whatever worked for the target audience. Surveys had shown that smokers found these ashtrays much more engaging than the alternatives and were more likely to use them. Independent evaluation showed the Ballot Bin reduced cigarette butt litter by 46%.

Working with businesses, it is proposed that the bins would be strategically placed outside nightlife hotspots across the Borough.

3.4 Compostable Straws

Tackling: ‘Single use plastics’ Pollution
Problem: Straws were one of the top ten offenders causing significant and growing pollution of seas and beaches, leading to plastics entering the food chain, harming animals, and ruining the aesthetic appearance of coastlines.
Solution: The current government was finally recognising the issues around plastics and there were plans for new legislation being introduced to tackle the problem of ‘single use’ plastics. This project would demonstrate Ards and North Down Council’s commitment to getting ‘ahead of the game’ and being proactive on this increasingly high profile agenda. This small but meaningful project would see all local cafés involved in the Council’s street café licence regime receiving 10000 compostable straws to displace plastic straws. The campaign would be used to encourage a general movement by local businesses to move away from the use of plastic straws.

3.5 14 x Post Primary Litter Packs

Tackling: Littering in and around Schools
Problem: Education of children and young people around the subject of littering was vital for a long term sustainable turnaround in community attitudes to litter.
Solution: This project would see 14 local post primary schools receive a large litter pick pack, to include items such as Litter Picks, Bags, Bibs, Gloves etc. This tied in with existing projects and allowed schools to have their own equipment thus being less reliant on the Council to supply equipment each time the school wanted to organise a litter pick. This would increase the litter picks carried out by schools but would more importantly increase education and awareness across the entire post primary school population of the problems created by dropping litter.

3.6 10 x 2 Min Beach Clean Boards

Tackling: Litter On Beaches
Problem: With 115 miles of coastline, litter on beaches was one of the top Cleansing priorities for the Borough.
Solution: Harnessing the good will in local communities, this project would support those wishing to ‘muck in’ and pick up some litter in popular local beauty-spots. The beach clean stations were A-Frame boards with an outer holder for litter pickers and an integrated holder for used carrier bags. Users took a litter picker and a used carrier bag, filled it up with litter for 2 minutes or more and disposed of the litter in nearby bins or recycling points. Used carrier bags were to be placed back into the holder ready for the next user. Each sign had a chain to stop it from opening and collapsing, a latch to keep it in the right position and was to be sandbagged on windy days. Monitored and operated by local environment groups this project again would not require many officer hours.

3.7 Summer Scheme Event

The Council’s Community Development Team was working with communities throughout the Borough to deliver 11 summer schemes. The final day would see all summer schemes across the Borough come together for a large fun day. This fun day would see 100’s of children come together in Aurora for a range of fun activities. It had previously been agreed all summer schemes would take part in a litter pick and a ‘thank you’ to them this fun day would be funded by RCIF and used to promote how it ‘pays’ to recycle and look after the environment, with communications and branding of the event designed to reinforce this message to all the children involved in the summer schemes.

3.8 10 x RCIF Branded Igloo Banks

Targeting: Glass Recycling
Problem: A need to supplement arrangements for capture and recycle glass. Solution: Despite glass caddies now being present in all households it had been recognised that some people would continue to use bottle banks. It had been estimated that 10 existing glass recycling Igloos had to be replaced. This continued to show a commitment in meeting the various recycling needs of the community. It also provided a potential promotional opportunity as those large bins could be specifically branded and used to promote RCIF and recycling in general.
3.9 General RCIF Promotional Campaign

The above projects combined with existing agreed and future projects such as CLEAR and Love Here Love Here Community Grants (all under the umbrella of RCIF) required significant promotion if they were to fully realise their potential to impact local residents, ensuring that all communities across the Borough really did get the message that it ‘pays to re-cycle’. This would require working with the corporate communications team in designing a targeted yearly RCIF PR Plan.

4.0 Summary/Conclusion

The Borough’s biggest asset was its natural environment and the above range of projects that were proposed to utilise the previous year’s RCIF underspend were designed to add to existing measures aimed at environmental protection and enhancement. Officers from across various departments were satisfied that they complemented many strands of the Council’s BIG PLAN and the various strategies that fed into it. Furthermore, it was considered that they were very much ‘on trend’ with rapidly evolving government and public awareness key environmental protection challenges. The projects were relatively unique and complemented by a smart PR package, would help to project Ards and North Down as an exemplar Council, leading the way in proactively protecting and enhancing the natural environment and in so doing contributing to the economic and social well-being of the Borough.

RECOMMENDED that approval be granted for expenditure of the underspend in the first year (2017/18) of the RCIF, on the projects outlined in this report.

Welcoming the report, Councillor Cathcart stated how good it was to be in a position to have additional money to spend and he looked forward to seeing the outcomes of that. He also sought a report back on the outcomes to assist in making decisions on other schemes.

Rising in support, Councillor Woods sought further information about the maintenance and repair of the Seabins, how often they would be emptied and by whom. She noted the collaboration with local groups and was keen for that to be encouraged.

In response, the Head of Regulatory Services advised that they had not yet reached that level of detail as they wanted to establish the finance for the projects first. He also noted that the idea of the Gum Bins and Ballot Bins for cigarette butts had come from a local group in Holywood.

Councillor Douglas welcomed the report and the ideas contained therein. Referring to the 2 Min Beach Clean Boards she noted that the pilot scheme run in Groomsport had been a success, however the one in Ballyholme had been problematic. She sought clarity on what the issues had been and whether assurances could be given that when the programme was rolled out, it would all work well. She also queried the safekeeping of litter pickers and the likelihood of them going missing.
The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the Parks, Cemeteries and Amenities Manager was overseeing this project and was currently working out how best to implement it. He also acknowledged that litter pickers did get stolen and there was learning to be had in respect of that issue.

Welcoming the report Councillor Hunter stated that a community group he had consulted on the proposals could not find fault with the proposed projects, which was great as they were like a ‘watchdog’ for the Borough. He referred to the Compostable Straws and highlighted that they could still be construed as litter as they did not biodegrade quickly, although he understood that when placed in green and brown bins with other compostable waste, they could be composted by the Council’s contractor using the ‘in-vessel’ technology. He believed they should also concentrate on eradicating Styrofoam plastic. He supported every project proposed.

The Director was delighted to hear that Members’ support and encouragement in respect of the proposals and he paid tribute to the officers involved in moving matters forward to this stage. He continued that whilst there were always naysayers in respect of new or innovative project proposals, officers were keen to take on all that was involved to see the projects delivered with successful outcomes for the community.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the recommendation be adopted.**

13. **RCIF 18/19 EXPENDITURE PROPOSALS (FILE 69001)**

**PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:** - Report dated 22 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above.

1.0 **Background to Recycling Community Investment Fund (RCIF)**

The purpose of the RCIF, as set out in the Council’s agreed Sustainable Waste Resource Management Strategy, was primarily to incentivise sustained enhancement in recycling engagement by the residents of the Borough. The issue of key importance in doing this, was making clear and unambiguous linkages between increased recycling engagement and the financial dividend that this delivered; demonstrating clearly that ‘recycling pays’. Now that the Council’s waste processing budget had been significantly reduced, it was imperative that the recycling levels which would be necessary to live within the Council’s new financial limits, were actually delivered – and the RCIF had a central role to play in this.

Over previous months’ various discussions had been held regarding potential mechanisms for deploying a RCIF, cognisant of a number of points of agreement by Members during discussions on the administration of a RCIF:

- Funded projects/initiatives should be as ‘tangible’ as possible and lend themselves to being readily and effectively communicated as significant benefits of the community’s recycling efforts.
• Deployment of the RCIF should seek to ‘add value’ in terms of the Council’s ability to address issues of key community concern.
• Benefits should be spread as widely as possible across the Borough.
• Balance should be struck between ‘breadth’ and ‘depth’ of community benefit accruing from the RCIF.
• Any project or initiative should be clearly branded and marketed as being a direct benefit of the community’s recycling efforts, to promote and incentivise sustained improvement in recycling engagement.

Building upon these principles, the agreed Aims of Objectives of the RCIF were as follows:

**Aims**
There were three broad aims of the Recycling Community Investment Fund:

a. To incentivise positive recycling behaviours by communities across the Borough, through reinvestment of consequent landfill tax savings directly back into supporting those communities.

b. To maximise the diversity of positive community impacts achieved by the fund, both in terms of geographic spread across the Borough and types of community support.

c. To contribute to delivery of the target outcomes set out in the Borough’s Community Plan.

**Objectives**
The objectives of the Recycling Community Investment Fund were to:

a. Spread the benefits of the financial recycling dividend and therefore the incentive to further engage in positive recycling behaviours, as widely and equitably as possible across the entire Borough.

b. Promote and support community ownership of and responsibility for specific local areas and the Borough as a whole.

c. Promote and support positive engagement in civic society.

d. Promote and support community safety and cohesion.

e. Promote and support the health and well-being of local communities.

f. Promote environmental education and environmental responsibility, particularly amongst the schoolchildren of the Borough.

g. Promote and support the attractiveness of the Borough as a place in which to invest, work, visit and reside.

h. Stimulate initiatives by communities to promote sustainability – economic, social and environmental well-being – of their own local areas and the Borough as a whole.

i. Support important aspects of community life which suffer from a clear resourcing deficit, either generally or because of prevailing competing financial pressures.

j. Support the development of services provided to the community directly by Council, over and above those provided for within the scope of normal agreed Council budgets.
2.0 Proposed 2018-19 RCIF Expenditure

In the context of the above aims and objectives and the now established scale of the RCIF (£200K per annum) it was proposed that the fund for 2018-19 be administered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Proposed Budget (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Live Here Love Here Small Grants Scheme (already agreed in March)</td>
<td>£75k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>C.L.E.A.R</td>
<td>£39k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Eco Champions</td>
<td>£8k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Summer Scheme</td>
<td>£10k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Schools Recycling Scheme</td>
<td>£15k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Community Group Litter Packs</td>
<td>£4k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Solar Powered Compacting Litter Bins</td>
<td>£15k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Promotion and P.R</td>
<td>£10k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£176</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 ‘Live Here Love Here’ Small Grants Scheme: Est. £75K

‘Live Here, Love Here’ was an existing environmental and community development small grant scheme that already had established and resourced mechanisms in place for operation, therefore disbursing RCIF funding in this way did not create any significant additional administration resource demands. (This element of expenditure of the RCIF had been agreed by the Council in March)

2.2 C.L.E.A.R: Est. £39K

Building on the success of the pilot year in 2017-18. Schools education was undoubtedly a fundamentally key aspect of the programme to improve the environmental behaviour of our community; by starting with children and young people whose attitudes and behaviours in later life would be shaped by what they learnt during their journey through primary and secondary school. (A detailed 2018-19 CLEAR Project proposal was addressed in a separate report.)

2.3 ECO Champions: Est. £8K

Sticking with the education theme and delivered by the Community Development Team throughout their play work groups, this project would see 150 children from Primary Schools learn about their local environment. Throughout the school year they would take part in a series of fun, educational and seasonal activities relevant to recycling and nature.

The project would finish with a celebratory event where they would hear directly from the children and what they had learnt over the year, presenting to their families within their communities. Each participant would receive an Eco-champion T shirt /water bottle.
2.4 Summer Scheme: Est. £10K

That summer had seen the well-publicised, RCIF funded Summer Scheme Funday. The fun day had been a collaborative celebration of the new Summer Scheme model. It had brought 500 young people together from across the Borough for a day of fun activities in Aurora. This proposal was to build on that success in the summer of 2019. The increased funds that RCIF provided would allow summer scheme opportunities to increase across the Borough. Throughout the summer scheme over 500 young people would enjoy learning from fun activities connected to re-cycling and nature. ANDBC summer schemes targeted disadvantaged areas and provided opportunities and experiences for young people that they would not otherwise enjoy.

2.5 Schools Recycling Scheme: Est. £15K

There currently existed a disparity between the free recycling service provided to schools in the Borough. This disparity was broadly along the legacy Council boundaries and service arrangements that had previously been in place – leading to variations in the levels of engagement by schools across the Borough in recycling of their waste. This proposal would seek to address this imbalance by the introduction of a free recycling service to all schools in the Borough (referred to in the separate report on future Trade Waste Service Model) and by using RCIF funding to provide equipment and infrastructure that would facilitate recycling by pupils and staff in the school environment.

The objectives of the proposal would be to:

- Reduce waste to landfill
- Increase recycling/composting rates in schools
- Reduce waste management costs to schools
- Improve schools’ environmental performance
- Assist with promotion the Eco Schools programme
- Establish long-term educational benefits by demonstrating good practice
As well as the hard equipment (classroom and playroom recycling bins etc.) each school would also receive a recycling pack to promote ‘Bin-Ovation’ and to encourage a holistic approach throughout the school encouraging staff, pupils and their families to act as community “recycling champions”.

This approach should inevitably produce a holistic outcome whereby not only did they significantly reduce the amount of residual waste collected from schools and sent to landfill but by promoting recycling practices/norms into the everyday school life of those involved, also reduce the amount of landfill waste collected at their homes.

2.6 Community Group Litter Packs: Est. £4K

It was proposed to supply Litter Pick Packs to Community groups currently organising Community festivals across the Borough.

The packs would contain equipment to help groups become more sustainable by effectively cleaning up themselves after their events (including separation of recyclable litter) thus reducing the cleansing costs to the Council, and would consist of items such as:

- Litter pickers
- Bags
- Gloves
- Hi Vis RCIF branded clothing
- Recycling Info
- Factsheet with H&S, Risk Assessment, Insurance and Council contact info

Each pack would cost £100 and with approximately 40 relevant groups the proposal would cost in the region of £4000 to deliver.

2.7 Compacting Solar Powered Litter Bins: Est. £15K

A destination Coastal Borough in close proximity to Belfast, Ards and North Down area regularly encountered large volumes of people at short notice and with it the inevitable increase in waste created meaning on occasion litter bins need emptied more frequently than they could be collected. Coupled with Northern Ireland’s unpredictable weather it was an ongoing challenge to accurately judge when bins require emptying. This often led to overflowing/unsightly bins at popular locations – having a detrimental impact on local communities/amenity.
Solar powered compacting bins offered a potential solution to that problem. Essentially they were a bin with a self-contained compacting unit which increased the capacity of the bin by a factor of 5. The compacting unit could be solar powered and chain driven removing the need for power and any significant maintenance. The system also incorporated a smart collection notification element meaning bins were only collected when they were full and there was a requirement to do so.

Case studies of those bin units had demonstrated a range of benefits, including:

- Reduction in the overall number of bin units required
- Significant additional litter capacity in each unit
- Reduction in collection frequency required
- Reduction in the number of vehicle movements and staff resource required to service bins
- Associated CO2 emission savings

Use of the RCIF for such a project was an opportunity to trial the effectiveness of this technology in benefitting local communities by promoting cleaner, greener open spaces.

2.8 Promotion and Public Relations: Est. £10k

As stated in the introduction to the report there was a significant amount of funding available to benefit communities across the Borough, as a consequence of the
reduction in the waste processing budget. There was a major challenge in making the public aware of this funding and how it was disbursed, to promote a clear and unambiguous linkage between increased recycling and the financial dividend that this delivered: demonstrating clearly that ‘recycling pays’ not only in terms suppressing any potential rate rises but also demonstrating the numerous ways the Council was effectively giving back to residents through the RCIF. To this end it was proposed that a significant ongoing communications campaign would be developed in relation to these projects both individually and collectively - continually pushing out this message throughout the lifetime of the Fund.

2.9 Further Projects:  Est. £24k

Several other potential projects that would meet the stated aims and objectives of the RCIF and significantly benefit local communities were currently being considered by officers. It was proposed that detailed proposals would be reported to the Committee as soon as possible.

3.0 Summary and Conclusion

It was proposed that the mix of projects summarised in the report represented a very diverse range of initiatives that met the agreed aims and objectives of the RCIF, providing value adding community benefits with significant demographic and geographic spread across the whole Borough. Officers were satisfied that effective communication of the projects individually and collectively under the banner of the RCIF, would serve to promote the main aim of the Fund which was to convey the message that ‘Your Recycling Pays’.

RECOMMENDED that approval be granted to proceed with disbursal of the 2018-19 RCIF as set out above (to include flexibility for adjustment of specific expenditure on each initiative as deemed appropriate by officers in the course of project implementation), with a further report to be brought back on additional projects proposed from the residual balance of the Fund.

In response to a query from Councillor Cathcart about the Compacting Solar Powered Litter bins, the Head of Regulatory Services advised that the cost would be approximately £5,000 per bin unit.

Staggered by that amount, Councillor Cathcart presumed that a cost benefit analysis would be done as part of the evaluation of this ‘pilot’ project and that the Committee would then have time to consider that prior to making any decision for the longer term. He sought further information on the working of the bins.

The Head of Regulatory Services advised that each bin had a self-contained compacting unit which increased the capacity of the bin many fold. The unit could come as a single bin or set of 2 or 3 bins to be used separately for landfill and recyclable waste. A decision would be made on their precise deployment and they would be located area(s) where there were particular peak demands for letter bin space.
The Director added that the bins did not require an external power supply given that they were solar powered. Furthermore, they were robust, vandal proof and looked quite striking. Officers still needed to tease out relevant factors and decide how best to trial the initiative.

Councillor Douglas sought further information about, and costs analysis for the Solar Bins. She also welcomed the ECO Champions initiative and Schools Recycling Scheme.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Councillor Douglas, that the recommendation be adopted.

14. CLEAR 2018/19 PROJECT PROPOSAL (FILE 92017)
(Appendix VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 14 August 2018 from the Director of Environment providing an update on the above and attaching Clear 2017/18 Project Evaluation.

1.0 Introduction

Members were reminded of the successful pilot CLEAR which saw 1413 young people from Year 8 in twelve schools across the Borough receive interactive environmental education funded by the RCIF. The purpose of this report was to propose that they continued to run the project. However, as expected, lessons had been learnt in the pilot year and this report would outline how they proposed to deliver CLEAR in 2018/19. The report should be read in conjunction with the report previously submitted to the Committee in April 2018.

2.0 CLEAR Proposed Target Outcomes

The evaluation demonstrated the over-arching outcomes of CLEAR were on point. In fact, since this project had been delivered in December 2017 it was felt the topics they were trying to tackle had received increasing coverage both nationally and globally. With that in mind, no changes were suggested. The following subject areas would still be taught, linking them with local issues affecting the global picture:

- Household Recycling
- Biodiversity & Sustainability
- Environmental Crime
- Dogs
- One use plastics
- Good Citizenship

3.0 Project Logistics

The travel arrangements alone for 1413 children from 14 different geographical locations had been a significant challenge and one from which lessons could be taken. Earlier contact with the schools was critical. This time pressure would be alleviated as schools now knew the benefits of CLEAR and achieving schools’ ‘buy-
in’ and commitment should not interfere with project time-lines to the same extent as with the previous year’s project.

Two schools had been unable to attend due to snow. Lack of options for ‘mop up’ sessions had been available. More ‘mop up’ sessions would be agreed that year if weather disrupted travel.

### 4.0 Project Delivery

Using the unique RADAR centre had been key in ensuring lessons were interactive and engaging for all learner types. The combination of RADAR and its staff being informed by Council officers had been key to ensuring the project’s targets for the subject areas were met, such as:

- Increasing knowledge and awareness
- Challenging existing perceptions
- Influencing current and future behaviours
- Using ‘pester power’ to influence family and friends

This successful combination would not change, however, as 17/18 was the pilot year, Council officers had to be on site to ensure the key messages were being delivered appropriately and accurately. It was envisaged CLEAR 18/19 would not require that level of Council officer commitment.

### 5.0 Project Legacy

As the evaluation highlighted, CLEAR had been extremely successful in challenging and influencing the behaviour and habits of the young people and indeed the teachers. However, capturing information on behaviour change over the longer term had to be developed in the 2018 project. It was hoped that CLEAR would pave the way to partnership working with schools and would enable the Council to survey young people again in years 10 and 12. Only then could they evaluate whether CLEAR had a long term positive impact on the environmental behaviours of the next generation in the Borough.

The uptake on the family environmental pledges the previous year had been somewhat disappointing, with less than 1/3 of 1413 potential pledges being returned to schools/Council. Using money as an incentive for the schools to then encourage families of pupils to take the pledge, only worked well in some schools. This year it was proposed that the prospect bursaries for schools would not be the only motivator. Better engagement and partnership with the schools throughout the process would be key in getting families to ‘take the pledge.’

### 6.0 Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>17/18 Budget £</th>
<th>17/18 Actual £</th>
<th>18/19 Budget £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18000</td>
<td>14130</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>5530</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
£50,000 had been budgeted for the pilot project the previous year. This had been a best estimate and in the context of the project being a completely innovative venture with no available benchmarks against which to more accurately calculate costs. The experience of the pilot had allowed officers to estimate more accurately for 2018. The proposed project budget for that year of £39,350 is a £10,650 reduction on the previous year’s budget, whilst still delivering the same/enhanced target outcomes.

7.0 Conclusion

Project evaluation demonstrated that CLEAR 2017 had been a success, however the pilot year had highlighted several areas for improvement. Logistics of the project and how they measured the long-term effects of CLEAR were the main areas for focus identified through the evaluation process.

RECOMMENDED that £39,350 from the RCIF is allocated towards a CLEAR 2018/19 schools environmental education project.

Referring to the 18/19 Budget of £18,000 for RADAR, the Chairman asked if it was too early to tell if that would go through given the recent announcement about future closure of the facility.

In response, the Head of Regulatory Services advised that RADAR was due to close in March 2019, although he was still hopeful that it would not come to that. He further advised that CLEAR would not be affected by the potential close in the current year and noted that contingencies had been put in place and were ready to be implemented if RADAR did close the following year.

Councillor Woods expressed the understanding that RADAR would not honour its bookings for this year and the Head of Regulatory Services responded that he had been assured that it would, however contingencies were in place just in case. Councillor Woods asked if officers were aware of any cross departmental funding and the Head of Regulatory Services advised that other funders had been contacted.

Councillor Cummings hoped the project would go ahead as it had been very successful to date. With respect to RADAR he queried whether the situation
presented an opportunity for local government to come up with a solution to help sustain such a project. He believed that as beneficiaries, there was an opportunity for inter-agency buy-in.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Woods, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the recommendation be adopted.

15. PROPOSED STREET NAMING (FILE FP/2018/1971/MAST/91200)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 13 August 2018 from the Director of Environment stating that a development comprising of 16 dwellings was currently under construction at 3 Faulkner Road, Bangor. The developer suggested Faulkner Grove, as the development was accessed off the existing Faulkner Road, Newtownards and was in keeping with the general neighbourhood.

RECOMMENDED that the street name Faulkner Grove be adopted.

FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the Council accepts the general name and delegates acceptance of suffixes to the Building Control department.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Dunlop, seconded by Councillor Edmund, that the recommendations be adopted.

16. GRANT OF PAVEMENT CAFÉ LICENCES (FILE 90101)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 16 August 2018 from the Director of Environment stating that applications for the grant of a Pavement Café Licence had been received as detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Premises</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Hours of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eighty-One</td>
<td>81 High Street, Hollywood BT18 9AQ</td>
<td>Darryl Flynn</td>
<td>Mon - Sat 8.00am - 11.00pm, Sunday 8.00am - 10.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Del Piero’s</td>
<td>1 Francis Street, Newtownards BT23 4JB</td>
<td>Stephen Smyth</td>
<td>Mon - Sun 8.00am - 10.00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applications had been publicly displayed on the relevant premises for 28 days as required in the legislation. No objections had been received.

DFI Roads and the Planning Service had been consulted and where necessary the PSNI. No objections had been raised to these applications.

Under the agreed conditions of licence, the pavement cafes would be required to:

- only use the agreed area to be outlined in the licence,
- provide only the approved furniture,
- completely remove any furniture from the pavement at the end of each day’s trading
- keep the area used for the café clean of litter and liquid spills
RECOMMENDED that the licences be granted.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Woods, seconded by Councillor Smart, that the recommendation be adopted.

17. GRANT OF ENTERTAINMENT LICENCES (FILE LR 100/90101)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 15 August 2018 from the Director of Environment stating that the following applications for the grant of licence had been received:

1. The Ranch, 95 Green Road, Bangor
   Applicant: Alison Rea, Hogstown Road, Donaghadee
   Day and hours of use: 14 unspecified days within the next 12 months during the hours of 9am and 1am.
   Monday to Sunday: Type of Entertainment:
   • Dancing, singing or music or any other entertainment of a like kind

2. Council Owned Premises:
   • Kilcooley Community Centre, Owenroe Drive, Bangor
   • Green Road Community Centre, Breezemount Grove, Bangor
   • The Hub, Hamilton Road, Bangor
   • Londonderry Park Pavilion, Portaferry Road, Newtownards
   • The Commons Pavilion, The Commons, Donaghadee
   Applicant: Ards and North Down Borough Council
   Day and hours of use: Monday to Sunday; 9am to Midnight
   Type of Entertainment:
   • Dancing, singing or music or any other entertainment of a like kind
   • Theatrical Performance

No objections had been received to any of these applications.

RECOMMENDED that the licences be granted.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the recommendation be adopted.
18. NOTICES OF MOTION

18.1 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Smith and Councillor Cathcart

This Council recognises the issue of marine pollution and the damage it is doing to the seas surrounding this island. We are committed to taking action to reduce the amount of litter in our waters and therefore I ask officers to bring a report which looks at the possibility of using Sea bins around our coast to tackle the issue of pollution in our seas.

Prior to speaking to his motion, Councillor Smith advised that, in light of what had been discussed earlier in the meeting, he had amended his motion to read as follows:

“This Council recognises the issue of marine pollution and the damage it is doing to the seas surrounding this island. As part of our commitment to tackle this, this Council commits to the purchase of 10 Seabins to help remove litter from the coastline of this Borough. The Council will furthermore have an educational campaign to coincide with their installation to explain their importance in helping tackle one of the biggest environmental challenges of our time.”

Councillor Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

Speaking to his motion, Councillor Smith acknowledged that they were all acutely aware of the damage that litter was doing to our seas, not only across the world but right here along this Borough’s coastline. The waste that was finding its way into waters was doing great harm to sea life, killing many of the creatures that lived in the marine environment as well as polluting others as they ingested the plastics and other litter that had invaded their habitat. On our own beaches and along our own shores we had witnessed an ongoing battle to keep them free of litter and debris. They had all probably taken part in beach cleans and been amazed at not only the amount of litter picked up but the variety of it as well. Indeed, the 2017 Marine Litter Report estimated that for every step taken on a beach there were 5 pieces of litter. From pieces of glass, bits of pottery, ropes, tyres and even sanitary products – all these and much more, had sadly found their way onto the shore. It seemed that no sooner had they completed a beach clean than they almost needed to start again such was the almost endless amount of litter that was brought ashore.

Continuing, he was very pleased that the Committee had recommended to the Council to purchase 10 Seabins. He believed this showed that the Council did not just want to talk about cleaning up their seas but were willing to take action to do just that. He stated that if this proposal was supported by the Council and once the bins were installed they would see the removal of over 5 tonnes of waste from their waters every year. The installation of those bins would also give us the opportunity to highlight once again the need to clean up our seas and look at the part we as individuals could play in being part of the answer rather that part of the problem. That was why he had asked for an educational campaign to accompany the purchase of the bins.
In concluding, he stated that the proposal to purchase the Seabins was to be welcomed, it was a very positive step forward and one of many more steps he hoped they could take in the future as they did what they could to clean up their seas.

As seconder, Councillor Cathcart rose in support and since Councillor Smith had outlined the environmental elements, he focussed his comments on the tourism aspects. He noted the Council’s focus on promoting the Borough’s coastline and marina’s as tourist destinations. He stressed the importance of education and encouraged continued working with Corporate Communications to highlight the issues and how they could be addressed. He further noted that even small steps like this could help address the global challenge of sea pollution. He hoped to see Seabins located in all twelve coastal towns if possible.

The Chairman was impressed to see how the Seabins worked and the impact they could have.

Welcoming the motion, Councillor Hunter highlighted that the Seabins were only suitable for enclosed areas such as marinas and harbours and stressed that this be borne in mind when deciding their locations. He also suggested that a local litter picking group be invited to make a deputation to the Committee.

The Chairman responded that the group would need to write to the Chief Executive and request to make a deputation.

The Head of Regulatory Services advised that to his knowledge no other Council in Northern Ireland or the UK had attempted such a scheme with Seabins and he acknowledged there was much to learn. He noted that Canary Wharf had bought 60 Seabins but he was not aware that any public sector organisation had bought any to date. He further advised that preliminary research had been carried out and officers were aware of several challenges to work through, but every endeavour would be made to produce positive outcomes from the initiative.

Councillor Wilson was excited by the motion and the idea that ten bins could remove 5 tonnes of waste from the sea every year. He sought clarity that there would be no additional spend to that agreed earlier in the meeting at Item 12.

The Director confirmed the significant amount of waste that could be removed by the Seabins, although that was in itself small when compared to the total amount of waste floating in local seas. However, he stressed the symbolic nature of the Seabin units, and advised that Council would be building an educational campaign around the project to maximise collateral impact. He added the campaign would be ongoing and would be built in to existing officer work programs with no additional budget requirement.

Councillor Douglas queried if the motion was required, given what had been agreed earlier in the meeting at Item 12.

The Chairman responded that the amended motion was probably different enough to be put through in addition to the earlier report, and he pointed out that the
recommendation of that report would still need to be ratified at Council and therefore not assured. He was delighted that the Council was setting a leading agenda.

Councillor Smith made his closing remarks, stating that the Seabins would remove at least 5 tonnes of waste from the coastline waters. He continued that if more than ten Seabins were required, then the Motion gave officers the leeway to ask for more and he considered that the Motion reinforced the recommendation at Item 12. He supported an education campaign for schools but believed it needed to go wider than just children and young people. He concluded that the symbolism alone would impact the public mind.

AGreed, on the proposal of Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

18.2 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor McIlveen

That this Council being mindful of its responsibilities under the Disability Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 2005 adopts a policy to prevent those who do not display a disability blue badge from using disabled parking spaces in Londonderry Park and provides a sufficient resource to enforce this policy.

Councillor McIlveen was not in attendance at the meeting.

AGreed, on the proposal of Councillor Cummings, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the Notice of Motion be deferred to the October meeting of the Committee.

18.3 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cummings

That this Council supports the introduction of Finns Law which seeks to amend the Animal Welfare Act 2006 to include a specific crime of injury to police dogs and horses, and writes to local MPs to support the bill and advocate for its legislative adoption in Northern Ireland.

Councillor Cummings spoke to his motion stating that during his career he had had the privilege to serve as a dog handler, however it had always perturbed him that service animals were referred to as property, just a piece of equipment.

He then went on to explain what Finns Law was, advising that on 5 October 2016 police dog Finn, had been chasing a robbery suspect when the suspect turned and attacked both handler and dog with a knife. Finn sustained serious stab wounds to the chest and head whilst protecting his handler, whilst the officer sustained a stab wound to the hand. The suspect was charged with ABH for the injuries to the officer but only criminal damage for the horrific injuries to Finn. At that time Constable Dave Wardell undertook to campaign for a law that would protect service animals. Sir Oliver Heald MP brought a Private Members Bill to make it an offence ‘to cause harm to a service animal.’ to amend the Animal Welfare Act 2006, a bill that had only recently navigated the second reading in The House of Commons.
Continuing, Councillor Cummings explained why this was significant to Local Government, Northern Ireland and PSNI (and other agencies). Local Government as the body responsible for upholding Animal Welfare, would understandably have an interest in this issue, both in terms of its consistency in law and its equivalence with Welfare of Animals Act 2011. The police service of Northern Ireland adhered to universal guidelines set out by the Home Office in terms of training of animals for service and were dependant on colleagues from other police forces across the UK to carry out assessments. It was a code of practice accepted by HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and the Association of Chief Police Officers and the Bill itself had been welcomed by the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners. It was therefore only natural that the PSNI Dog Handlers should come to expect the same courtesy and given the same level of protection for their animals as would be given to their colleagues in police forces across England and Wales.

Referring to the legislation, Councillor Cummings advised that currently it had had its second reading in Government and was now at ‘Committee Stage’ which presented them with an opportunity to amend the Bill. Ultimately they had an opportunity to petition their two sitting MPs, to address the committee. The motion was seeking to including Northern Ireland in the bill - seeking reference to the Welfare of Animals Act (NI) 2011 and to support its transition through parliament.

In concluding, Councillor Cummings reiterated that he had had the immense privilege of working as a Dog Handler, and it had always disturbed him that they were simply referred to as a piece of kit, nothing more than property. Police Dogs were remarkable animals that brought immense joy as they did an extraordinary job. He referred to them as ‘Occasional Clowns ... Perpetual Heroes’ – four legged friends who deserved appropriate legislative protection in Northern Ireland.

He sought Members support for the motion.

(Councillor Boyle left the meeting at this stage – 8.32pm)

Rising in support, Councillor Edmund highlighted that there were already regulations in place to protect other animals and therefore it made no sense to exclude working animals such as police dogs, which fulfilled such a vital role. He hoped Members would support the Motion.

The Chairman queried if the legislation would apply to army dogs.

Commending Councillor Cummings for his worthy Motion, Councillor Smart stated that service animals were intelligent, feeling animals fulfilling a vital role; it was great that there were people who looked after such animals once their service life was over. He hoped to see a good outcome from the Motion.

(Councillor Boyle returned to the meeting at this stage – 8.34pm)

Other Members rose in turn to offer their support for the Motion and Councillor Cummings thanked them for that, particularly as it was something that was close to his heart. He confirmed that prison and military service dogs would also be included.
AGREED, on the proposal of Councillor Cummings, seconded by Councillor Edmund, that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

(Councillor Dunlop left the meeting at this stage – 8.37pm)

**EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED, on the proposal of Councillor Edmund, seconded by Councillor Wilson, that the public/press be excluded during the discussion of the undernoted items of confidential business.

19. **STRATEGIC REVIEW OF TRADE WASTE SERVICES MODEL – UPDATE REPORT**
   (Appendix VII)

*** COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE ***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

**READMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED, on the proposal of Councillor Edmund, seconded by Councillor Douglas, that the public/press be readmitted to the meeting.

22. **ANY OTHER NOTIFIED BUSINESS**

There were no other items of business.

NOTED.

**Circulated for Information**

a) Correspondence from DEFRA dated 17 July 18 re Deposit Return Scheme

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Woods, seconded by Councillor Wilson, that the correspondence be noted.

**TERMINATION OF MEETING**

The meeting terminated at 8.58 pm.
ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Regeneration and Development Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Thursday 6 September 2018 at 7.00 pm.

PRESENT:
In the Chair: Alderman McDowell
Aldermen: Irvine
Smith
Councillors: Adair Smart
Cummings T Smith
Dunlop Walker
Gilmour Woods
Menagh

In Attendance: Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning (S McCullough), Head of Regeneration (B Dorrian), Head of Economic Development (C McGill), Temporary Head of Tourism (S Mahaffy), Temporary Head of Tourism (R Richardson) and Democratic Services Officer (J Glasgow).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend were received from Councillors Allen, Armstrong-Cotter, Cooper and Ferguson.

NOTED.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were notified.

NOTED.

3. PORT MARINE SAFETY CODE AND PRESENTATION ON THE PORT MARINE (Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning attaching Port Marine Safety Code presentation. The report detailed Council previously agreed to have a presentation by the Bangor Marina Manager and Harbour Master, Mr Kevin Baird, on the Port Marine Safety Code which was summarised below.

Harbour authorities appoint a harbour master and may properly entrust the operation of the harbour to such professional people. In the case of Bangor Marina that
function was carried out by Mr Baird. Under the Code’s Marine Safety Management System a Duty Holder needs to be identified. The Duty Holder was accountable for safe and efficient marine operations. In the instance of Bangor Marina, the Duty Holder was Ards and North Down Borough Council. The duty holder could not assign or delegate its accountability for compliance with the Code.

Below was a summary of the salient points of the Code:

**Port Marine Safety Code (PMSC)**
The code applied to all harbour authorities and other marine facilities, berths and terminals in the UK. The Government supported the non-mandated Code as the most effective and efficient way of maintaining and promoting nationally recognised safety standards for harbours, ports, marine facilities etc.

The PMSC was conceived 1996 in the wake of the Sea Empress disaster.

The Sea Empress was a fully loaded tanker carrying 130,000 tonnes of crude oil which foundered on the rocks entering Milford Haven Port. It was not just an environmental disaster.

- 72,000 tonnes of heavy crude oil were spilled around the beaches of South Wales
- The clean-up operation took 5 years and cost an estimate £60 million
- The reputation of Milford Haven suffered in the full glare of publicity.
- The cost of the claims ran into millions and severely affected the ports finances.
- The enquiry found fault with many aspects of the ports marine operations including pilotage, training, command & control, hazard and risk not being identified and reviewed regularly and deficiencies with emergency response.

**PMSC developed 2000**
The UK Port Marine Safety Code (PMSC) was developed in 2000 and offers a national standard for port safety in the UK with the aim to "improve safety for those who use or work in ports, their ships, passengers and cargoes, and the environment"

Introduced to the UK Maritime industry as a voluntary code in 2002.

Reviewed every three years the latest edition was published in 2016, and the accompanying document ‘The Guide to Good Practice’ was last published in 2018.

The PMSC was regulated by Maritime Coastguard Agency

Although voluntary, the Code is regulated by the MCA and compliance statements were required every 3 years.

The code addressed 10 key measures to achieving compliance.

1. The Duty Holder must be clearly identified.
2. The Designated Person must be clearly identified.
3. Legislation, a harbour was required to review the legislation under which it operates.
4. Duties & Powers, a harbour must review its duties and powers and seek additional powers if necessary.
5. Risk Assessments, a harbour must identify all hazards and risks, assess them and apply controls to reduce risk to as low as reasonably practicable.
6. Marine Safety Management System (MSMS), a harbour must develop a MSMS to cover every facet of marine operations.
7. The MSMS must be reviewed and audited regularly.
8. The harbour must employ appropriately qualified and competent people in key roles e.g. Harbour Master, Pilots, VTS Officers etc.
9. The harbour must produce and publish a Marine Safety Plan and measure its performance against this plan.
10. The harbour must review its aids to navigation (buoys, lights, beacons, marks) in line with General Lighthouse Authorities (C.I.L.) requirements and send in appropriate returns.

The Code was intended to be flexible enough that any size or type of harbour or marine facility would be able to apply its principles in a way that was appropriate and proportionate to local requirements.

RECOMMENDED that Council notes this report.

The Chairman welcomed and introduced Kevin Baird, Bangor Marina Manager and Harbour Master to the meeting and invited him to undertake his presentation.

Mr Baird undertook a PowerPoint presentation on the Port Marine Safety Code, a copy of which was attached as Appendix I. He circulated Members with a memory stick which contained good practice documents for Members to read.

The Director highlighted to Members that the quarterly updates from Quay Marinas would continue to update the Committee in respect of the marina. However she wished to ensure that Members understood that the Regeneration and Development Committee was the duty holder.

Councillor Gilmour thanked Mr Baird for the informative presentation and raised questions regarding the Committee's remit in respect of the other Harbours. The Director clarified that for the other 5 Harbours the duty holder was the Environment Committee. Mr Baird explained that he had been appointed the designated person for the other 5 Harbours within the Borough.

Alderman Smith welcomed reading the Quay Marinas quarterly update. She questioned what occurred in the case of an emergency and asked if Mr Baird was continuously on duty. In response Mr Baird explained that he was on duty 24/7 and he worked closely alongside the Lifeboat and the Coastguard in Belfast where he could utilise resources when required.

Councillor Walker questioned the responsibility of the Committee. In response the Director explained that as the Duty Holder the Committee was to ensure that the Harbour was appropriately managed, ensuring safe operations through adequate processes and that the Committee had confidence in those processes and that there was expertise in place to manage the marina.
Councillor Walker asked about the personal liabilities. In response Mr Baird explained that the responsibility was both individual and collective for compliance with the code.

(Councillor Gilmour withdrew from the meeting – 7.22 pm)

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted.

4. **SHINE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (FILE ED40)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that on 18 May 2018, the Economic Development section submitted a final funding application for the SHINE Programme (“the Programme”), to Invest Northern Ireland and the European Regional Development Fund under the Investment for Growth & Jobs Northern Ireland (2014-2020) Programme. The application had now received approval for a Local Development (LED) resource grant (not exceeding £274,760) at a rate of 80% of vouched and approved expenditure.

**The Programme**

The Programme was a business mentoring programme which aimed to create new jobs and improve the competitiveness of existing SMEs operating in the Ards and North Down Borough Council area. The programme would develop the capacity and capability of small business owner/managers to prepare growth strategies that could drive new investment, increase sales turnover and profitability, improve efficiency and create employment.

Ards and North Down Borough Council also offered a number of business wrap-around services including an annual comprehensive support programme, business advice and complementary research. All participants on the Programme will also be able to avail of those services. The main objectives of the Programme were as follows:

**Objectives of the Programme**

- 360 individual businesses engaging in the programme
- 330 businesses recruited for mentoring support
- 100 businesses to receive 1.5 days of mentoring
- 200 businesses to receive 3 days of mentoring
- 30 businesses to receive 5 days of mentoring
- 280 jobs to be created within 3 years of the programme’s completion, by 31st December 2024 (resulting in a proposed cost per job of £1,226)
- 30 businesses referred to Invest NI (the pipeline)
- 70 businesses referred to other sources of support and assistance

**Funding**
The total value of the programme which would run from 2018 to 2022 is £343,450 and was 80% funded by Invest Northern Ireland and the European Regional Development Fund under the Investment for Growth & Jobs Northern Ireland (2014-2020) Programme. The remaining 20% funded by Ards and North Down Borough Council comes from existing budgets and amounts to £68,690.

The Economic Development Manager and Business Development Executive would be responsible for the co-ordination and management of the Programme. The Letter of Offer was signed by the Chief Executive and sealed at the August Council meeting. Work was now underway to procure a suitable delivery agent through CPD to allow the programme to roll out in Autumn/Winter 2018. Procurement through CPD was requirement of the programme to draw down LED2 funding.

RECOMMENDED that:

1. The Committee notes the approval of the SHINE Programme under the European Regional Development Fund under the Investment for Growth & Jobs Northern Ireland (2014-2020) Programme
2. The Committee agrees to match fund the programme to the value of £68,690 (20% of total value of the Programme) between 2018 and 2022
3. The Committee notes the procurement of a delivery agent via CPD procurement process in order to comply with the LED2 funding guidelines

Proposed by Councillor Adair, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the recommendations be adopted.

Councillor Walker referred to the objectives of the programme and questioned if the target to create 280 jobs within 3 years was ambitious enough. In response the Head of Economic Development stated that the target needed to be ambitious vs what was achievable. She explained that the programme was an EU programme and therefore there were constraints in the targets that could be set under the auspices of the funding agreement.

AGREED, that the recommendations be adopted.

5. NOMINATION AT SOCIAL ENTERPRISE NI AWARDS 2018 (ED35)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that Social enterprises add significant value to the Borough and work alongside the private and public sector to deliver benefits for the greater good of society.

Social Enterprise NI was the representative body for social enterprises in Northern Ireland and had operated the Department for the Economy’s social economy programme since 2012. Its role was to raise awareness of the social enterprise business model and its members across all sectors, private, public and educational.
Social Enterprise NI’s Annual Social Enterprise Awards recognise the valuable contribution that Social Enterprises make to the Northern Ireland community, environment and economy.

In July 2018, Ards and North Down Borough Council submitted an application for the “Best Council” Award for its business development programme ANDSEP (Ards and North Down Social Entrepreneurship Programme).

The programme ended on 30 November 2017 with very strong results including:

- 19 jobs created with a further 22 jobs projected over the next 12 months
- 16 new products/services developed
- Over £600,000 of funding leveraged from a variety of sources

This year’s Annual Awards would take place at the Stormont Hotel on 19 October 2018. The awards had grown as an event over recent years and offer good publicity both to the winning Social Enterprises and the sectors helping to promote the positive social and economic impact they produce.

**Finalist for ‘Council of the Year’ Award**

In July 2018, submission of the ANDSEP programme for the “Council of the Year” category in the Annual Social Enterprise NI Awards.

On 10 August the Economic Development Section was informed that Ards and North Down Borough Council had been shortlisted as a finalist for this award.

The Council had now been invited to nominate representatives to attend the Awards evening on 19 October 2018.

The cost for attending the event was as follows:

- £75 for an individual (member rate)
- £650 for a table of ten (member rate)

**Sponsorship of an Award**

In 2016 and 2017, the 11 Councils jointly sponsored one award category at a cost of £273 per Council paid from the NIBSUP Marketing budget. This year again, Social Enterprise NI had approached the Councils in order to seek sponsorship for one category. It was agreed by the 11 Councils consortium to again opt for the Bronze Package at a total cost of £3000.

As part of the Bronze Package, two free places would be offered to Councils. The EDM had expressed the wish to have one Member from Ards and North Down Borough Council nominated to take up one of those free places.

RECOMMENDED that Council:

1) Sponsors one Award category as part of the 11 Council Consortium, the cost of which will be paid from the NIBSUP Marketing Budget, which is existing
budgets, and provisionally nominates one Member to take up one of the two free places.

2) Nominates Head of Economic Development and one member to attend the Social Enterprise NI Awards Evening, as finalists for the ‘Council of the Year Award’, on 19 October 2018 at the Stormont Hotel at a cost of £75 per person.

(Councillor Gilmour re-entered the meeting – 7.24 pm)

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Smart, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the recommendations be adopted and that the Chairman or his nominee attend the Awards Evening.

6. **PLANNING THE FUTURE OF THE BRITISH HIGH STREETS**

(Appendix II)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning attaching details on British High Street Symposium. The report detailed that British High Streets were witnessing a decline in their ability to attract shoppers and visitors. Footfall had continued to shrink, with 3% less shoppers between March and May 2018 compared to the same period in 2017 (IPSOS 2018). The decline had economic repercussions, and many shops had been forced to close. A BBC report (2017) found a decline of 17% in the number of retailers operating in the towns studied. That was expected to impact the number of retail jobs available in town and city centres, with retail positions expected to decline by 900,000 by 2025 (Deloitte 2017). Online shopping had limited the high street’s potential market, as had a decrease in disposable income, with 3% inflation of prices cancelling out wage growth of 2.2% (Bank of England 2018).

In Ards and North Down over recent months Council had witnessed the closure of stores such as CarpetRite and Poundworld with the loss of more than 40 jobs among other imminent closures of independent stores such as Surf Mountain and Scrabo Furnishings.

The Integrated Tourism Regeneration Economic Development Strategy highlighted the need to re-energise our towns and to take action to ensure our towns and villages were vibrant and attractive, sustainable places.

**Symposium on High Street Challenges**

The Public Policy Exchange body for the UK was organising a symposium which offered an opportunity for local authorities, retailers, planning authorities and landlords to discuss the challenges facing British high streets and to share best practice in order to address those substantial issues.

**Delegates would:**

Assess methods to maximise infrastructure spending to best support high streets
- Investigate how relevant stakeholders can collaborate most effectively
- Analyse how to overcome the barrier of unaffordable housing near high streets
• Understand the high street’s role in developing a sense of community in urban areas
• Learn how to use social media effectively to promote high street retail shops
• Discover the best practices used to promote increased footfall on high streets
• Understand the effect business rates have on the success of high street stores
• Identify the way to record footfall and how to use this data effectively

Event Details

• **Date:** Wednesday 31 October 2018
• **Time:** 10:15am – 4:30pm
• **Venue:** Central London

**Costs for Local Authority & Public Bodies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Booking Rates</th>
<th>Standard Booking Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(until 19th September 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Place</td>
<td>£236</td>
<td>£295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ places</td>
<td>£212</td>
<td>£245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flight Cost per person (dependant on time of booking) approx. £50

RECOMMENDED that Council approves two Senior Officers from the Regeneration, Development and Planning Directorate to attend the conference and to bring a report on any learnings.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the recommendation be adopted.

(Councillor Dunlop withdrew from the meeting – 7.25 pm)

7. **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE REPORT Q1 2018-19 (FILE 160127)**

(Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning attaching first quarter report. The report detailed that Members would be aware that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil the requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

• Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
• Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
• Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2017/18 plan published 15 June 2017)
• Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2017)
The Corporate Plan 2015-19 sets out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outline how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key points to note:**

- One of the main reasons for the variation of spend against budget was due to staffing vacancies which needed to be filled. Those were currently being addressed with HR.
- Bookings of the Signal Facility had generated more income than estimated which had offset spend against budget.

**Key achievements:**

- Demand for the services of the business support services remained high and feedback shows the service was valued and positively impacts business’ development plans

**Emerging issues:**

- Business Start targets had fallen behind target, Council was working with the delivery partner on a plan.

**Action to be taken:**

- The filling of posts and completing the process of transformation was a priority to enable actions and KPIs to be met. Officers were working with HR to complete the process as soon as possible.
- Officers were closely monitoring performance to ensure the Enterprise Agencies had adequate resources and measures in place to deliver and recover the number of Business Starts to ensure Council meet the targets set.

RECOMMENDED that the Council notes this report.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the recommendation be adopted.
8. **TOURISM EVENTS GRANTS SCHEME 19/20 (FILE TO/EG40)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that as approved by Council in December 2017, Tourism Events Grants totalling £81,600 were awarded to 14 organisations for events taking place during the period 1 April 2018 – 31 March 2019.

Completed evaluations from event organisers were typically received right up to February 2019, so officers would bring a report to committee in March 2019 on the outputs achieved through the grant programme, particularly as they contributed to key targets for tourism gains set out in the Integrated Tourism, Regeneration and Economic Development Strategy (ITRDS). Those were to increase share to overnight trips to Northern Ireland by 10% and visitor expenditure from £46m to £82m by 2030.

In the interim however, looking ahead to the 2019/20 awards process, the Events Manager and newly appointed Events Officer (Evaluation and Grants) had been working proactively with event organisers to improve methods of data collection and estimation of economic return while at the same time enhancing support to the organisers in completing the application process and improving data gathering. That report sets out the detail of the enhanced process proposed for the 2019/20 Tourism Grants programme.

**Proposed Tourism Grants Process 2019/20**

With the appointment of the Events Officer (Evaluation and Grants), the Tourism section had been in a much better position during 2018 to support the grants process much more actively, attending more of the grant-aided events to monitor attendance and council branding and providing marketing and audience development guidance to organisers.

A review of the current tourism grants process had been undertaken to streamline the application process and encourage more events with genuine appeal to visitors (ie attendees from beyond the borough or NI), as reflected in increased bednights and visitor spend within the borough, relative to the Council’s investment in the events.

An initial review was carried out via desk research, looking at the grants application process across other councils in Northern Ireland and that of other funding bodies such as Tourism Northern Ireland, the Arts Council for Northern Ireland, Community Foundation NI, the Ulster Scots Agency and government departments. Officers also supplied market research questionnaires to 2018/19 grant recipients to garner their feedback on the current grant process.

The information gathered would be used to enhance the 2019/20 process where appropriate, bringing Ards and North Down Borough Council into line with other funding providers and ensuring that Council were deploying a process which:

- was transparent
- provided best value for money for ratepayers
Changes to the grants process for 2019/20 were proposed as follows:

- Updated application form incorporating and redesigned guidance notes using simplified language.
- Creation of an online video showing how to complete the application form.
- More emphasis on demonstration by the grant recipient of best value for money in line with council targets and procurement policy.
- Updated event criteria with changes to encourage organisers to try to secure more visitors and bednights from outside the Borough and provide evidence of how they had assessed that.
- Monitoring of press coverage of grant-aided events by Council officers.
- Removal of freelance and/or consultancy fees from eligible costs.
- Specification of a formal appeals process.
- Specification of the deductions process operated should a grant recipient fail to submit all required evidence.
- An initial meeting with successful applicants to aid planning of marketing, event management and awareness of VIC resources available for promotion of the event, plus a scheduled meeting between the Events Officer (Evaluation and Grants) and each event organiser six weeks ahead of their event, with the officer then using the online Microsoft Project Planner to regulate timelines and schedule the grants process.
- Inclusion of trade shows, conferences and conventions as eligible events provided they have tourism potential, and active promotion of the grant programme to organisers of these types of event.
- Provision of a market research questionnaire template to successful grant applicants to facilitate them to gather feedback from event attendees and participants.
- Provision of enhanced training for those reaching the 3rd year of funding via Tourism Events Grants aimed at increasing the self-sufficiency or these events and reducing their ongoing reliance on Council funding.
- Provision of training on safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults.
- Provision of training on PR, marketing, social media and digital platforms.
- Introduction of an Event Protocol Process (That document would be applicable across all Council departments awarding grants and will provide a step-by-step guide to booking an event on Council land, hosting a ticketed event or implementing a large-scale event which might require resources and support from across multiple Council departments. That protocol was currently at draft stage/under consultation with other departments.)

RECOMMENDED that Council approve the proposed changes to the Tourism Events Grant Scheme as outlined.

Proposed by Councillor Adair, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the recommendation be adopted.
Councillor Smith noted the change to the grants process to include trade shows and conventions as eligible events and asked if any of those were planned. In response the Head of Tourism (R Richardson) advised that the events team was working on researching such events.

(Councillor Dunlop re-entered the meeting – 7.28 pm)

In response to a question from Councillor Cummings, the Head of Tourism (R Richardson) advised that there was a review currently occurring on the grants process across the Council. The review of the Tourism Events Grants Scheme was separate and the revisions ensured that the scheme was aligned with the plan and the targets. Although separate, the Head of Tourism stated that Officers would take on board the outcome of the overall review.

Alderman Irvine asked if there would be merit in the creation of small, medium and large event categories to ensure that the smaller events were not competing with the larger events in terms of bed nights etc. In response the Head of Tourism (R Richardson) advised that the grant available ranged from £500 - £10,000. She reminded the Members that it was a tourism scheme and the aim was to provide economic benefits, attracting visitors to increase visitor spend and bed nights.

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted.

9. CHRISTIAN HERITAGE WORKING GROUP MINUTES
(Appendix IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Woods, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the minutes be noted.

10. QUARTER 1 2018-19 TOURISM PERFORMANCE REPORT
(FILE TO/TD/15)
(Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that Members would be aware that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2017/18 plan published 15 June 2017)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2017)
The Corporate Plan 2015-19 sets out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outline how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key points to note:**

- Council had approved the Tourism structure as permanent and the process to complete filling of posts in underway.
- Event attendee figure was on target.

**Key achievements:**

- Social media development with Corporate Communications: First quarter Instagram posts had been developed for daily updates April-June covering borough wide, destination themes. Reach 30k+
- PR over target – Comber Earlies Event PR exceeded expectations. This was assisted with the additional promotion provided by the celebrity chef Jean Christophe Novelli, who mentioned his appearance at the upcoming event on national daytime television and provided vlog material which achieved widespread coverage.
- Seaside Beach Awards at Ballywalter, Groomsport and Millisle

**Emerging issues:**

- Further training was required in house to fully utilise Customer Relationship Management opportunities
- Underspend Q1 related to finalisation of temporary structure May/June and continuing vacant post in VIC and marketing secondment. To be resolved in Q2 and new permanent structure.

**Action to be taken:**

- Progress permanent structure
- The schedule for Internal Audit was now finalised. The Tourism service had no scheduled Audits in 18/19 (all Audits complete in 17/18), however would feed into other departmental audits as required. The Performance Unit had
advised that due to no Audit requirement in Tourism in 18/19 the target relating ‘% satisfactory audit reports’ should be removed from the Tourism Performance Report 18/19.

RECOMMENDED that the Council approves the removal of the Performance Indicator relating to Audit Reports from the Tourism Performance Report 18/19 and further notes the content of the report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Gilmour, seconded by Councillor Smart, that the recommendations be adopted.

(Councillor Adair and Councillor Dunlop withdrew from the meeting – 7.31 pm)

11. BRIDGE BETWEEN NORTHERN IRELAND AND SCOTLAND
(Appendices VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning attaching Chief Executives letter, Secretary of States responses and Scottish Government response. The report detailed that Council previously agreed to write to the First Minister for Scotland, the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland and in the absence of the Executive the Permanent Secretary of the Department for Infrastructure welcoming discussions on the potential bridge between Scotland and Northern Ireland and requesting the east coast of the Borough be considered in any feasibility study or business case as a possible connection point.

A response had now been received from the Cabinet Secretary for Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity, Scottish Government and the Permanent Secretary, Department for Infrastructure. No response had been received to date from the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland.

RECOMMENDED that Council notes the content of the report.

Proposed by Councillor Smith, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the recommendation be adopted and that the Council respond to the Scottish Government thanking them for their letter and indicating that the Council looks forward to working with them in the near future.

Councillor Walker was confused as to why the Council would respond to the letter given that the response letter from the Scottish Government made it clear that there no plans imminent. Also, he felt the response would need to detail where the Council felt the bridge should land. Councillor Walker felt that if the Council where to respond, guidance needed to be provided. He expressed concerns that areas of special and/or significant interest would be destroyed by the creation of a bridge.

Councillor Cummings felt that it would be an act of courtesy to respond to the letter and would maintain the relationship between the two authorities on the matter.

Alderman Smith noted the great deal of interest that had been expressed regarding the bridge and was confident that all areas would be looked at. Alderman Smith stated that she looked forward to the future developments.
Councillor Wilson expressed concerns regarding the environmental impacts of a bridge and stated that he could not support the proposal.

Councillor Smith expressed his disappointment with the comments made by the Members of the Alliance Party. He referred to the letter from the Scottish Government which detailed there had been no robust assessment of the costs or the benefits of such a proposal. It was clear that the delivery of any fixed link would be complex, would present challenges and it would be premature to speculate any options. The letter further detailed that initial discussions had taken place exploring connectivity between Scotland and Northern Ireland and the Scottish Government was keen that those discussions would continue to progress.

Councillor Smith requested a recorded vote which resulted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (7)</th>
<th>AGAINST (4)</th>
<th>ABSTAINED (0)</th>
<th>ABSENT (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menagh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong-Cotter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted and that the Council respond to the Scottish Government thanking them for their letter and indicating the Council looks forward to working with them in the near future.

12. **CHAMBERS OF TRADE FUNDING ALLOCATION (FILE REG61)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning attaching Guidance notes, Letter of Offer and Monitoring template. The report detailed that at the March 2018 Committee an update on the work with the 5 Chambers was presented, which highlighted activity undertaken by the Chambers from their 2017/18 Business Plans. The Regeneration Section had continued to work closely with the 5 Chambers of Commerce to develop new two-year plans as requested by the Council.

In April 2018 a series of one-to-one meetings took place with the Chambers seeking feedback on the following:

- the Business Plan approach
- the need for further Financial and Partnership assistance from the Council
- how systems could be improved going forward
In May 2018, a combined 5 Chambers meeting was held to further discuss the Business Plan approach. The outcome was that the 5 Chambers had agreed to submit a further 2-year Business Plan, covering April 2018 – March 2020, building on the 2017/18 Business Plans. Currently 4 Business Plans had been submitted. It was proposed that the Council continued with financial assistance up to £12,000 per year for the 2018-2020 period for each Chamber, subject to receipt of a satisfactory Business Plan and the appropriate procedures being followed.

Following discussions with the 5 Chambers, the need was also identified for a more structured approach that would ensure a documented agreement of what was being delivered. The Regeneration Section had developed Guidance in response to Chamber feedback. The purpose of the Guidance was to identify what was eligible for financial assistance and how the financial assistance would be administered.

The goal of the financial assistance was to grow the Chambers of Commerce and ensure they continued to be a key stakeholder in aiding the delivery of strategic plans for their towns and to enable them to identify and deliver initiatives which were local and specific to each town’s needs.

The Regeneration Unit proposed to issue a Letter of Offer awarding the funding, which clearly set out the conditions on which the offer was made.

Six monthly Progress Reports would be required by the Chambers and one-to-one meetings would be used to monitor progress against targets. The Chambers also continued to have dedicated support from Council Officers.

The Regeneration Section, in tandem with coordinating the above process, was beginning the process of collecting “intelligent data” on the 5 Town Centres and putting systems in place to measure vacancy rates and footfall and monitor any fluctuations in trends.

RECOMMENDED that the Council agrees to award up to £12,000 per year per Chamber for 2018 – 2020 period and that Officers proceed with the process outlined above.

Proposed by Councillor Smith, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the recommendation be adopted.

Councillor Walker referred to the procurement process and highlighted that the lowest price did not also achieve best value although recognised that was difficult to evaluate. He questioned the reasoning for 3 written quotes being obtained for spend less than £3,000.

The Head of Regeneration explained that the procurement limits where set out by Council and an outcome of the audit highlighted the need to tighten up on the procedures. The lowest price would not always be accepted if the applicant could show best value. The new procedures provided protection for the Chambers.

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted.
13.  **LT. W. D. KENNY, VC MEMORIAL**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that as previously reported the newly renovated Marine Gardens in Donaghadee was named in memory of ‘Lt. W. D. Kenny, VC’.

In 2017 an official naming ceremony took place with the unveiling of a Memorial, which was situated on the new promenade behind the War Memorial.

The Council had received a number of complaints that the Memorial was being persistently used by dogs, to urinate against. Elected Members, town center stakeholders and residents had requested that the matter was addressed.

It was proposed the Memorial was put on a plinth, which would prevent the dogs urinating against the actual Memorial stone, but it would not stop the issue entirely.

The existing stone would need to be removed from its concrete base and a new base installed and existing stone affixed to it. The proposed plinth would be black granite, with a fine honed finish which was durable and would complement the existing limestone.
RECOMMENDED that the Council proceeds as above.

Proposed by Alderman Smith, seconded by Councillor Menagh, that the recommendation be adopted.

Councillor Smith welcomed the installation of a plinth for the memorial. He wondered if some form of action could be taken to remind dog owners not to let their dogs urinate against the memorial.

Councillor Walker highlighted that the memorial was on a public walkway and questioned if there would be value in re-siting the memorial onto the raised memorial garden.

The Head of Regeneration stated that the memorial and its location had been discussed with the family. Discussions then had occurred through the Donaghadee Town Steering Group, if the Committee decided to move the memorial the proposal would need to be discussed with the Kenny family and brought to the Steering Group.

Councillor Walker proposed an amendment that the plinth and the memorial be relocated to the memorial garden and the appropriate discussions occur. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Wilson.

Councillor Smith was content with the amendment but stressed the importance of the family being consulted.

Councillor Gilmour questioned if planning permission was required to move the memorial. The Head of Regeneration confirmed that a planning application would need to be submitted.

Councillor Walker withdrew his amendment.

Councillor Smith suggested that contact be made with the Kenny family to ascertain their thoughts on the memorial being moved.

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted.

(Councillor Cummings withdrew from the meeting – 7.49 pm)

14. **PROJECT 24 - QUARTERLY REVIEW**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that Project 24 was a temporary revitalisation project located on Queen’s Parade, Bangor.

An innovative and impressive project which had captured the public’s interest, bringing vibrancy and interest to a previously underused and dilapidated area within the town centre.
Project 24 utilised 6 bespoke artist pods split into 2 individual artists’ mini studios, creating 12 studios.

Project 24 was always envisaged as a temporary project pending the Queen’s Parade development. Council approval for the project to continue was currently to December 2018 (with planning permission to April 2019).

1.0 Artists

Project 24 facilitated a variety of artists specialising in a range of mediums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>No of Artists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>April 2013 – March 2014</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>April 2014 – March 2015</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>April 2015 – March 2016</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>April 2016 – March 2017</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>April 2017 – March 2018</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>April 2018 – December 2019</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total No of Artists to date: 100

Phase 6 – all art pods were fully occupied with a waiting list of interested artists. Current occupiers were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pod</th>
<th>Artists</th>
<th>Mediums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Pod 1</td>
<td>Nu Ink, Nicholas Glendinning</td>
<td>Tattoo Artist &amp; Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Pod 2</td>
<td>Copperhead Cakes, Leah Kerr</td>
<td>Cake Decorator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilac Pod 1</td>
<td>Royal Elite Candle, Elena-Cristina Cojocariu</td>
<td>Sculpture, Wax Carving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilac Pod 2</td>
<td>John Patterson</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Pod 1</td>
<td>Duncan Irvine</td>
<td>Drawing &amp; Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Pod 2</td>
<td>Sharon Regan</td>
<td>Ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Pod 1</td>
<td>Andrew Haire</td>
<td>Drawing &amp; Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Pod 2</td>
<td>Art by Klog, Karen Logan</td>
<td>Mixed Media Painting &amp; Felted Artwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Pod 1</td>
<td>Debra Wenlock</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Pod 2</td>
<td>Buttonmoon, June Onyekwelu</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Pod 1</td>
<td>Adair to Dream, Danielle Adair</td>
<td>Painting, Abstract Sculpture &amp; craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Pod 2</td>
<td>Twisted Pixie Jewellery, Shelagh McCaughan</td>
<td>Handmade Jewellery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.0 Artist Development

The following range of support was available for each artist to avail of;
- 1-1 confidential business advice and signposting service
- Complimentary research services (i.e. to identify marketing contact lists)
- Access to an annual programme of events and workshops
- Specific workshop training
- 1-1 specialist mentoring
Within that reporting period the following development sessions where available for the artists to attend;
- Funded Business Support for your Business
- Emotional Intelligence
- GDPR

There would also be various support services available from the Economic Development team including an intensive mentoring programme, geared towards businesses with the potential to create employment. A Digital Programme for SMEs was also being scoped at present.

3.0 Events

Project 24 continued to host a variety of high quality, interesting events. Events were varied in style, nature and audience profile.

Project 24 continued to permit the hire of The Hub for private events.

6 Events (to date):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Allocated Budget</th>
<th>Expected Visitor No’s</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Actual Visitor No’s</th>
<th>Cost per head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>02.04.18</td>
<td>£17,000.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>£15,724.95</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>£3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundown Market</td>
<td>26.05.18</td>
<td>£10,000.00</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>£10,385.00</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>£0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Multicultural Event</td>
<td>16.06.18</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£410.00</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>£0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Art</td>
<td>17.06.18</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£1,202.00</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>£3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Out for Summer</td>
<td>30.06.18</td>
<td>£5,000.00</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>£4,141.80</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>£0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Easter ‘Sails and Tales’ Event took place throughout Bangor Town Centre, with Project 24 hosting ‘The Wonka Experience’. The Wonka Experience was attended by 4,500 visitors.
- 91% of those who attended the event would actively recommend it to family and friends
- 96% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that there was a good variety of activities for all ages
- 95% of respondents stated that they were very satisfied or fairly satisfied with the event overall
- 84% of respondents could think of nothing that could be done to improve the event compared to 35% last year

The Sundown Market, was the highest attended Sundown Market event to date with visitor numbers rising from 8,000 in 2015 and 13,000 in 2017 to 15,000 in 2018.
- 41% of attendees rated the food and drink as 5 out of 5 with the remaining 49% rating it as 4 out of 5.
• 67.84% of the audience were return customers
• 40% of the audience spent between £25-£50 on food and drink
• 44% of the audience became aware of the event via social media and 31% via word of mouth
• Facebook event page had a reach of 16,000

The Schools Out for Summer Event attracted 6,500 visitors to Project 24.
• 65% of visitors were return visitors
• Visitors were asked to rate the event on a scale of 1-10 (1 being poor and 10 being excellent) 74.02% rated it as 10 and 19.48% rated it as 9.
• 98.73% of visitors stated they would attend future events at Project 24. 1.26% of visitors stated they would not attend future events but this was due to the travel distance (Enniskillen)

Upcoming Events;
• Film Festival – 04th – 07th October 2018
• Haunted Hub – 27th October 2018
• Christmas Event – 17th November 2018
• Movie in The Hub – 08th – 09th December 2018

To date Project 24 facility had hosted a total of 119no events, attracting an audience of 212,705 visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 (Apr 13-Mar 14)</th>
<th>13no events</th>
<th>8,750 visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (Apr 14-Mar 15)</td>
<td>28no events</td>
<td>16,935 visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 (Apr 15-Mar 16)</td>
<td>35no events</td>
<td>38,360 visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 (April 16-Mar 17)</td>
<td>22no events</td>
<td>67,470 visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 (April 17-Mar 18)</td>
<td>16no events</td>
<td>54,340 visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6 (April 18-Current)</td>
<td>5no events</td>
<td>26,850 visitors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 Marketing

Project 24 continued to utilise a range of marketing methods to raise awareness of the project and the artists.

Facebook

Project 24 continued to engage with the public via the Project24NI facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>22nd September 2015</th>
<th>1,834 likes</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16th September 2016</td>
<td>2,461 likes</td>
<td>34% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th September 2017</td>
<td>2,662 likes</td>
<td>8.1% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 2018 (8mth period)</td>
<td>2,862 likes</td>
<td>7.51% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>22nd September 2015</th>
<th>0 followers</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17th September 2016</td>
<td>2,409 followers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th September 2017</td>
<td>2,614 followers</td>
<td>8.5% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 2018 (8mth period)</td>
<td>2,862 followers</td>
<td>9.48% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Website

Project 24 website, www.project24ni, continued to act as an information hub for artists, events, news and more.

Print

A5 8pg Information Booklet – x5,000 – artist listing, event listing and contact information. Distributed throughout the Borough. Launched June 2018.

Advertising

Double page spread – Local Women Magazine – Artist promotion feature
Half page event listing – Spectator and Chronicle Summer Supplement

5.0 Other Business

Project Management Board

Project 24 Project Management Board continued to meet on a quarterly basis. The board consisted of representatives from The Department for Communities, YMCA, For A Better Bangor and Harbour Ward Residents Association.

Anti-social Behaviour

There had been one incident reported to 31st May 2018, which resulted in damages to hub costing £1,000 to repair. PSNI investigated, however, no evidence or witnesses was available. Some new procedures had been put in place:

▪ CCTV remained in operation onsite
▪ Community Safety Team continue weekend patrols
▪ Community Safety Team meeting with artists to provide guidance and awareness
▪ Community Safety Team patrols conducted during onsite events

RECOMMENDED due to the success of the project and the current status of the Queen’s Parade project, it is recommended that the Project 24 project is extended until December 2019.

Proposed by Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the recommendation be adopted.

Alderman Irvine noted the continuous success of Project 24 and asked if there had been any problems lately with anti social behaviour. The Head of Regeneration was pleased to report that there had been no issues lately and the efforts of the Community Safety Team had paid off.

Councillor Smith asked what would occur with Project 24 after Queen’s Parade, would it disappear or be reinvented elsewhere? The Head of Regeneration reminded the Members that Project 24 was only meant to be in situ for 24 months. A model would be explored once the Queen’s Parade design was known.
Councillor Wilson advised that Councillor Douglas and himself had met with the YMCA regarding the anti-social problems at Queen’s Parade and noted the contribution they had made in addressing the problem.

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted.

15. Q1 REGENERATION UNIT PERFORMANCE REPORT
(Appendix VII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning attaching first quarter report. The report detailed that Members would be aware that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2017/18 plan published 15 June 2017)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2017)

The Corporate Plan 2015-19 sets out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

Reporting approach

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key points to note:

- Underspend due to projects both within the Rural and Urban Sections still being finalised.
- Two posts remain unfilled.
- Two members of staff within the Urban Section were on long term sick.
Key achievements:

- DfC funding for Urban projects was now available and a number of applications were being developed.
- P24 operating at full capacity.

Emerging issues:

- Large number of projects were ongoing concurrently.
- Village plan projects taking longer to obtain community buy-in than anticipated.

Action to be taken:

- Staff absences being managed under the Council’s attendance policy.
- Agree a deadline for the adoption of village plan projects with the groups.

RECOMMENDED that the Council notes this report.

Proposed by Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Gilmour, that the recommendation be adopted.

Councillor Walker referred to the emerging issues and asked the Officer to expand as to why the village plans projects were taking longer to obtain community buy-in than anticipated. The Head of Regeneration explained that the process had taken longer than had first been anticipated. The village plan groups contained a number of community representatives and there were occasions where the ideas and opinions were competing. The Officer stated that he hoped to bring a report on a programme of works for the village plans to the October meeting of the Regeneration and Development Committee.

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted.

16. **REDBURN SQUARE REVITALISATION SCHEME**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that following public realm schemes, the Department for Communities (DfC) provided an allocation of funding for revitalisation works. Those cover areas such as shop frontage refurbishment, marketing activity and actions to enhance footfall into town centres and improve the visitor experience.

Following consultation within the Holywood Town Centre Steering Group, a prioritised Action Plan for a Redburn Square Revitalisation Scheme had been developed and an application for funding had been submitted to DfC as follows:

- Total funding applied: £40,000 with match funding from Council of £4,000
- Designated areas: Redburn Square, Hibernia Street (lower end), Sullivan Place
- Period of funding: September 2018 – March 2019
### Project Overview and Budget Allocation

**Redburn Square Revitalisation Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DfC Funding</th>
<th>AND Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Key Stakeholder Meetings</td>
<td>Holywood Town Centre Steering Group meetings - secure engagement in the scheme from all involved within the local business community.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree Action Plan</td>
<td>Steering Group to agree Action Plan for the delivery of the Redburn Square Revitalisation Scheme. Consequently Council to obtain costings for initiatives. Consequently Council to submit application to DfC for approval.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redevelopment, Design &amp; Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Shop-Front Improvement Scheme</td>
<td>Assist business property owners/tenants to invest in their buildings, making the area more attractive for people to visit, invest and shop in.</td>
<td><strong>£17,500.00</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td><strong>£17,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christmas Lighting Feature</td>
<td>Enhance the christmas lighting within the scheme area</td>
<td><strong>£11,000.00</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td><strong>£11,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement works</td>
<td>Improvement/ tidy up works to entrance of Redburn Square (Sullivan Place)</td>
<td>£3,480.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td><strong>£5,480.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing and Promotion</strong></td>
<td>Shopping Bags</td>
<td>Promotional shopping bags to market the scheme area</td>
<td><strong>£4,000.00</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td><strong>£4,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Google Virtual Tours</td>
<td>Bespoke virtual tours of local businesses for google.</td>
<td><strong>£1,750.00</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td><strong>£1,750.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fingerpost Signage</td>
<td>Signage to key attractions within the town</td>
<td>Only applicable if surplus funds</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical vinyl wrap</td>
<td>Vinyl wrap the cabinet in Redburn Square with historical images</td>
<td><strong>£520.00</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td><strong>£520.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>Social Media Business Training</td>
<td>One to one social media business mentoring/ training (1/2 day per business) - 7 no businesses.</td>
<td><strong>£1,750.00</strong></td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td><strong>£1,750.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Quantity Surveyor</td>
<td>Appointment of Quantity Surveyor to review and approve shop frontage scheme</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td><strong>£2,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
<td>Completion of quarterly progress reports to DfC.</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tender Reports</td>
<td>Completion of tender reports to DfC/ CPD.</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Project Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>PPE Surveys</td>
<td>Business and shopper surveys to inform PPE.</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPE Report</td>
<td>Post project evaluation report.</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFC Budget</th>
<th>AND Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£40,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>£44,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Redevelopment, Design & Maintenance**

**Organisation**

- **Key Stakeholder Meetings**
  
  Holywood Town Centre Steering Group meetings - secure engagement in the scheme from all involved within the local business community.

- **Agree Action Plan**
  
  Steering Group to agree Action Plan for the delivery of the Redburn Square Revitalisation Scheme. Consequently Council to obtain costings for initiatives. Consequently Council to submit application to DfC for approval.

---

**Marketing and Promotion**

- **Shop-Front Improvement Scheme**
  
  Assist business property owners/tenants to invest in their buildings, making the area more attractive for people to visit, invest and shop in.

- **Christmas Lighting Feature**
  
  Enhance the Christmas lighting within the scheme area.

- **Improvement works**
  
  Improvement/ tidy up works to entrance of Redburn Square (Sullivan Place).

---

**Training**

- **Social Media Business Training**
  
  One to one social media business mentoring/ training (1/2 day per business) - 7 no businesses.

---

**Monitoring**

- **Quantity Surveyor**
  
  Appointment of Quantity Surveyor to review and approve shop frontage scheme.

- **Progress Reports**
  
  Completion of quarterly progress reports to DfC.

- **Tender Reports**
  
  Completion of tender reports to DfC/ CPD.

---

**Post Project Evaluation**

- **PPE Surveys**
  
  Business and shopper surveys to inform PPE.

- **PPE Report**
  
  Post project evaluation report.

---
Under the shop frontage scheme, grants would be available for 75% of the works up to a maximum of £3,000.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves the report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Woods, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the recommendation be adopted.

17. RURAL VILLAGE STAKEHOLDER FORUM

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that over the last year, Officers had ongoing discussions with various village groups and representatives to identify suitable projects to be taken forward from their Village Plans to avail of Rural Development Programme funding under the Village Renewal Scheme. The approach and structure taken in each village varies, from community group committees, to regeneration committees, to a select group of representatives, depending on the strength and capacity of the local community.

Going forward, it was important that appropriate structures were established to ensure accountability and good corporate governance in the delivery of actions identified in village plans. It was essential therefore that Rural Village Stakeholder Forums were established, which were representative of all interest groups within each settlement.

Those new Rural Village Stakeholder Forums would also act as a mechanism to raise and consult with on issues linked to the Council or other initiatives, such as the Big Plan. Therefore, relevant statutory agencies and Council Officers would be invited to attend meetings to discuss any issues pertaining to their service area. In addition, the minutes of the Rural Village Stakeholder Forums would be presented to the Regeneration and Development Committee for adoption and subsequent approval by the Council.

Long-term that approach heightens the profile of the Stakeholder Forums in terms of their status and importance within the community. If that happened successfully, those new forums would become the ‘go to group’ for consultation.

Methodology for Development of Village Forums

Officers had consulted with County Down Rural Community Network (CDRCN), who work directly with rural towns and villages across the Council area, on the most suitable approach to take that initiative forward.

CDRCN had expressed an interest in assisting the Council to establish 8 Rural Village Stakeholder Forums across the Borough during 2018/19, using the following methodology:

- Mapping of the community infrastructure in each Village
- Holding community stakeholder workshops
- Developing partnership agreements

It was anticipated that all 8 Rural Village Stakeholder Forums would be fully operational by March 2019, at which point the process and progress would be reviewed and consideration given to a further programme for the remainder of the villages. The cost proposal provided by CDRCN was £3,000 for a total of 24 days’ work (3 days per village). It was also felt that if the process was undertaken by CDRCN it give it more validity.

RECOMMENDED that Council appoints CDRCN to undertake the process of establishing Rural Village Stakeholder Forums and that draft terms of reference will be agreed in consultation with the new groups.

The appointment of each forum and the agreed terms of reference would be presented to Committee for approval in due course.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Smart, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the recommendations be adopted.

18. **REGENERATION AND DEVELOPMENT BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT – JULY 2018 (FIN45)**
(Appendix VIII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning detailing that the Regeneration and Development Budgetary Control Report covered the 4-month period 1 April to 31 July 2018. The net cost of the services was showing an under spend of £86,742 (6.8%).

**Explanation of Variance**

In addition, a Budgetary Control Report by Income and Expenditure for Regeneration and Development was shown which analysed the overall favourable variance (£86,742) by expenditure (£22,675 favourable) and income (£64,066 favourable).

**Regeneration & Development**

**Expenditure - £22.7k (1.5%) better than budget to date.** The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following: -

1. Regeneration - £10.5k adverse. The adverse variance was more than offset by a £46.7k favourable income variance (see 4 below) and was explained by: -
   a. Payroll £21.1k favourable due to 2 vacancies in Urban Development (£9.1k) which would, hopefully, be filled in October and a vacant post in Craft Development (£14.4k).
   b. Donaghadee THI grant payments were £45.5k over budget but that was offset by increased grant income (see 4a below).
   c. There were small favourable variances in running costs for Craft Development (£7.3k) and Rural Development (£4.9k).
2. Economic Development - £5.8k favourable. That was mainly due to an underspend of £4.1k on payroll.

3. Tourism - £27.8k favourable. That favourable variance was explained by: -
   a. There was a small favourable payroll underspend to date of £4.4k.
   b. There were small favourable variances on running costs for Ards VIC (£2.4k), Bangor VIC (£2.6k), Tourism Marketing (£2.5k), Experience Ards (£2.5k) and Tower House (£1.7k).
   c. The Easter event was £13.9k under budget and the Puppet Festival was £4.4k over budget.

**Income - £64.1k (27.5%) better than budget to date.** The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following: -

4. Regeneration - £46.7k favourable. That was mainly due to: -
   a. Donaghadee THI grants were £46.9k favourable. The Council had paid out more grant than budget so should receive more grant funding (see 1b above).

5. Economic Development - £6.2k favourable. That was mainly due to Signal Centre income being better than budget to date.

6. Tourism - £11.1k favourable. That was mainly due to the following
   a. Tourism income was £4.1k favourable – there were small favourable variances for Bangor VIC (£1.7k) and Experience Ards (£1.1k).
   b. Events income was £7.0k better than budget to date. There were favourable variances for the Easter event (£1.3k), May Day (£2.0k), Sea Bangor (£2.6k) and Puppet Festival (£1.2k).

### BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT
**By Directorate and Service**

**Period 4 - July 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Year to Date Actual</th>
<th>Year to Date Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 Regen, Dev &amp; Planning HQ</td>
<td>47,068</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>317,100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Regeneration</td>
<td>268,635</td>
<td>304,900</td>
<td>(36,265)</td>
<td>1,315,900</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Economic Development</td>
<td>229,921</td>
<td>241,900</td>
<td>(11,979)</td>
<td>1,116,200</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340 Tourism</td>
<td>652,234</td>
<td>691,300</td>
<td>(39,066)</td>
<td>1,954,500</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,197,858</td>
<td>1,284,600</td>
<td>(86,742)</td>
<td>4,703,700</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED that the Committee notes this report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Gilmour, seconded by Councillor Smart, that the recommendation be adopted.

19. NOTICES OF MOTION

19.1 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor McI'veen

That this Council explores with the Historic Environment Division of the Department for Communities ways in which this Council can facilitate the opening of The Priory in Newtownards during peak tourist periods.

Proposed by Councillor McI'veen, seconded by Councillor Smith, that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

Councillor McI'veen spoke to the motion recalling legacy Ards Borough Council had used the Priory for events. For some time The Priory had been locked up and the area had experienced problems with anti-social behaviour. Councillor McI'veen outlined the history of The Priory. The structure had been founded in 1244 by the Savage family. Subsequently it was destroyed and restored by Sir Hugh Montgomery who added a small church but it fell into disrepair in the middle of the 18th-century. Today the remains could be seen with some additions from later centuries.

Councillor McI'veen expressed his disappointment that the facility had not been used given that the structure represented Newtownards legacy. The motion sought to open The Priory during peak tourist times. Previously the opening of the structure had been discussed with Officers and the Newtownards Town Steering Group but no progression had been made hence the reason for the submission of his motion.

Councillor Smart rose in support of the motion and said it was a shame that the structure had lay closed for some time and felt it would be a great attraction for not only tourists but for the people living in Newtownards. Councillor Smart felt there was
a great opportunity for a Service Level Agreement with the HED and The Priory had great potential for events to be held.

Councillor Menagh supported the comments that had been made. He noted that scaffolding had been erected inside the structure for some time.

In summing up, Councillor McIlveen stated that he had attended meetings with the HED on the built heritage of the town and they were supportive of making The Priory accessible to the public.

AGREED, that the recommendation be adopted.

19.2 **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cooper**

In light of the substantial obvious increase in the population of Comber as a result of new building developments, officers urgently investigate introducing a one way system from Mill Street and Castle Street towards The Square as quickly as possible, to alleviate the existing (and future worsening), traffic congestion, and bring back a report as to how to proceed and facilitate this provision forthwith.

Due to the absence of Councillor Cooper, it was proposed by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Menagh and

AGREED, that the Notice of Motion be deferred to the October meeting of the Regeneration and Development Committee.

19.3 **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Martin and Councillor Dunne**

This Council asks for an update report to be brought forward on the redevelopment of Grey Point Fort in Helens Bay with due regards to current funding streams, overall timescales and milestones on this project. This is an important military landmark in our Borough and is currently in need of a considerable amount of refurbishment. Council also requests an informal meeting between Senior Officers, stakeholders and local military historians to update them and discuss future plans for the site.

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the Notice of Motion be deferred to the October meeting of the Regeneration and Development Committee.

19.4 **Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Thompson**

That Council officers bring back a report with costs regarding the extension in 2019, of the Sunday Musical Concerts, currently being held in Ward Park to other venues across the Borough including the Ards Peninsula Villages.

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the Notice of Motion be deferred to the October meeting of the Regeneration and Development Committee.
EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Gilmour, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the public/press be excluded during the undernoted items of confidential business.


***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

21. **NI BUSINESS START UP PROGRAMME (NIBSUP) (FILE ED43)**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).


***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

23. **TENDER FOR THE OPERATION OF PICKIE FUNPARK 2019-2021**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).
24. **QUEEN’S PARADE UPDATE**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

25. **BELFAST REGION CITY DEAL**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

26. **REDEVELOPMENT OF KINNEGAR LOGISTICS BASE**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

**RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Smart, seconded by Councillor Walker, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

27. **ANY OTHER NOTIFIED BUSINESS**

There were no items of any other notified business.

**TERMINATION OF MEETING**

The meeting terminated at 8.50 pm.
ITEM 7.5

ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Corporate Services Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Tuesday, 11 September 2018 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor Gilmour

Aldermen: Carson Graham
Gibson Keery
Girvan

Councillors: Brooks Muir
Chambers McIlveen
Kennedy Smith

Officers: Director of Organisational Development and Administration (W Swanston), Head of Finance (S Grieve), Head of Performance and Projects (A Scott), Head of Administration (A Martin), Compliance Manager (S Teer) and Democratic Services Officer (H Loebnau)

In Attendance: Colm McQuillan, Owen Brady, Ailbhe Hickey

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Smart and Councillor Hunter. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor T Smith.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor McIlveen declared an interest in Item 15.5 – Notice of Motion and Alderman Keery informed the meeting that he sat on the Board of the Northern Ireland Housing Executive.

3. DEPUTATIONS

3.1 NORTHERN IRELAND HOUSING EXECUTIVE – HOUSING INVESTMENT PLAN
(Appendices I and II)

The Chairman welcomed the three representatives of the Northern Ireland Housing Executive to the meeting; Colm McQuillan, Owen Brady, Ailbhe Hickey.

Colm McQuillan thanked the committee for the opportunity to address them and advised that the Housing Investment Plan had 2 main purposes.
The Housing Executive was statutorily required under the 1981 Housing Order to report to councils on its past year’s performance and next year’s proposals.

The Housing Executive was a Community Planning Partner and the Housing Investment Plan (the HIP) provided an evidence base that would inform Community Planning.

He provided an overview of the housing market.

After consultation with a range of stakeholders the HIP provided an overview of the housing market in the Ards and North Down Borough Council Area.

The HIP examined cross tenure housing issues and detailed social housing investment at a local level.

It was a 4 year plan with an annual update in intervening years. This was the third and final annual update. A new 4 year Plan would be produced in 2019.

In future years it would be reviewed to reflect Community Planning priorities.

The Housing Investment Plan contained 5 themes:

- Identify and meet housing need and demand
- Improving people’s homes
- Transforming people’s lives
- Enable sustainable neighbourhoods
- Delivering quality services

The key housing issues for Ards and North Down and their implications were discussed within the HIP; those included

- An ageing population
- Total Housing Executive stock was 6,310 units
- A slight decrease in the waiting list
- 3,060 total applicants
- Increase in those presenting as homeless – up 12%

The Housing Executive would take on board the Council’s views going forward and would reflect the community planning priorities. The Executive was facing a tight financial year going forward but would attempt to maintain the standard of its work going forward.

Councillor McIlveen praised the work of the Housing Executive and thanked them for the presentation. He asked about community involvement in the making of housing decisions. Some people had concerns about the type of community engagement which was taking place. The Belfast Telegraph had raised the abuse of points and he wondered if steps were being taken to address that.
In response Members were informed that each group participating in consultations were examined and needed to be properly constituted. However, there was only so much the Housing Executive could do and it was not in a position to police how people lived their private lives.

The Department of Communities had made 20 recommendations dealing with the allocations process. Intimidation points had been reduced however there was still a perception that some people were able to abuse the system.

Alderman Girvan asked if the Executive could explain the reason for the 12% increase in homelessness. The biggest categories for homelessness were relationship breakdown, the loss of private rentals and domestic violence. Very often the people classified as homeless had dependent family members.

There had been a moratorium on rent increases across the United Kingdom until 2020. Housing Executive rents were just over half that of Housing Association property and private rentals.

However, with tighter financial circumstances the Housing Executive had fallen behind in terms of investing in its stock. Alderman Girvan suggested that shared housing schemes be introduced and it was agreed to put forward that suggestion.

Addressing the point of local people having priority in any area and receiving extra points it was noted that a small number of points resulted in the need to open up areas to everyone which was thought to be fairer overall.

The Chairman thanked the members of the Housing Executive for attending and they left the meeting at 7.30 pm.

NOTED.

4. BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT – JULY 2018 (FILE FIN45)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive dated 30 August 2018 detailing that the Budgetary Control Report covered the 4-month period 1 April to 31 July 2018 and the Revenue Budgetary Control Report by Directorate was set out. The Net Cost of Services for the period was £13.85m against a budget of £14.22m, hence, showing an under spend of £370,966 (2.6%).

Income from District Rates less charges for Capital Financing was £15.01m versus a budget of £14.74m representing £266,613 of favourable variances on the same. Consequently, that resulted in the Council having a full surplus at the end of July of £1,158,879 compared with a budgeted surplus for the same period of £521,300 resulting in a favourable variance on expected surplus of £637,579.

As the report could become quite lengthy as the financial year progressed and the other standing Committees received their own specific budgetary control reports consideration was being given to preparing a more concise report for this Committee.
Explanation of Variance

A Budgetary Control Report by Income and Expenditure by Directorate was shown which analysed the overall favourable variance (£637,579) as expenditure (£582,161 favourable) and income (£55,418 favourable). However, if the net nil distorting effect on income and expenditure of Peace IV grants (see Community & Wellbeing 2b and 4a) was removed then the variance for expenditure was £388,761 favourable and income £248,818 favourable.

COMMUNITY & WELLBEING

Expenditure - £308.3k (6.8%) better than budget to date. The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following: -

1. Environmental Health - £10.0k favourable. That was mainly explained by a small underspend on payroll (£8.2k).
2. Community & Culture - £208.0k favourable (£14.6k favourable after allowing for the net nil distorting effect on income and expenditure of Peace IV grants).
   a. Payroll £17.2k favourable mainly due to an underspend in Community Development (£17.8k). The vacant Manager and Coordinator posts would be filled in September.
   b. Peace 4 grant payments were £193.4k under budget to date due to a delay in the project starting (SEUPB delayed approvals) but that was offset by a similar adverse variance on income – see 4a below.
3. Leisure & Amenities - £90.1k favourable.
   a. Payroll £19.6k favourable which was mainly due to small underspend in Community Halls/Centres (£8.3k) and Leisure Admin (£12.4k – 1 vacant post).
   b. Ards LC (£28.0k), Comber LC (£6.8k), Portaferry SC (£4.1k) and Londonderry Park (£8.3k) running costs (excluding payroll) were £47.2k under budget to date. That more than offset the adverse income variance (see 5a below).
   c. Ards Half Marathon was underspent by £8.0k as the event was not held this year.
   d. There were a number of small favourable variances to date for other Leisure services such as Sports Pavilions £3.5k, Sports & Football Development £5.1k and Sports Development grants £3.2k.

Income - £216.6k (13.8%) worse than budget to date. The adverse variance was mainly made up of the following: -

4. Community and Culture - £188.6k adverse (£4.8k favourable after allowing for the net nil distorting effect on income and expenditure of Peace IV grants).
   a. Peace 4 grant income is £193.4k adverse but that was offset by a similar favourable variance on project spend – see 2b above.
5. Leisure & Amenities - £41.1k adverse.
   a. Income at Ards LC (£24.9k adverse), Comber LC (£1.4k adverse), Portaferry Sports Centre (£2.2k favourable) and Londonderry Park (£1.6k adverse) was £25.7k behind budget to date but that was more than offset by reduced running costs (see 3b above).
   b. Football Development income was £8k behind target to date.

ENVIRONMENT

Expenditure - £14.5k (0.2%) better than budget to date. The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following:

   a. A combined summary of the main waste stream variances was set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.2k tonnes more than budget though gate fee slightly less than budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Green bin waste</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.2k tonnes more than budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue bin waste</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.3k tonnes less than budget but gate fee is higher than budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC waste</td>
<td>(18.9)</td>
<td>Lower tonnage than budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the main waste stream budgets were showing an adverse variance of £21.5k.

b. Payroll costs were £62.4k favourable to date. There were a significant number of posts being covered by agency.

c. Street sweepings were £5.9k over budget to date.

d. Waste haulage costs were £10.0k over budget to date.

7. Assets and Property Services - £37.2k adverse. That was explained by:
   a. Property Operations were £31.7k over budget to date. That was mainly due to:
      i. Payroll costs are £10.4k favourable mainly due overtime being £8.8k under budget to date.
      ii. Contractor costs were £44.1k over budget to date. There had been more planned and reactive property maintenance carried out to date.
   b. Technical Services were £12.7k under budget to date. That was mainly due to:
i. Payroll costs were £5.9k favourable mainly due to vacant posts which were currently being covered by agency.

ii. Utility costs were £43.3k under budget to date.

iii. Contractor costs were £36.7k over budget to date. That covered areas such as statutory compliance work, refurbishments, playgrounds, statutory upgrades and energy saving initiatives.

c. Fleet Management was £25.3k over budget to date. That was mainly due to:

i. Payroll costs were £12.0k. There was a vacant mechanic’s post which was in the process of being filled.

ii. Vehicle maintenance and tyres costs were £20.1k over budget to date.

iii. Vehicle fuel, lubricants and oil were £16.7k over budget to date.

8. Regulatory Services - £33.1k favourable. That was explained by:

a. Payroll costs were £28.8k under budget year to date. There was a vacant post in Building Control which was in the process of being filled. In addition, 2 vacant posts in Neighbourhood Environment Team were now being covered by agency.

Income - £51.2k (3.3%) worse than budget to date. That adverse variance comprised:

9. Waste & Cleansing Services - £25.9k adverse. That was mainly due to trade waste income (£26.8k) being worse than budget to date.

10. Assets and Property Services - £11.8k favourable. Harbour berthing fee income (£7.3k) and wind turbine income (£5.4k) were better than budget to date.

11. Regulatory Services income - £37.1k adverse. That was mainly due to Building Control income (£30.0k), Property Certificate income (£2.8k) and Car Park income (£8.0k) being behind budget to date.

REGENERATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING

Expenditure - £68.7k (3.1%) better than budget to date. That favourable variance was mainly made up of the following:

12. Regeneration - £10.5k adverse. The adverse variance was more than offset by a £46.7k favourable income variance (see 16 below) and was explained by:

a. Payroll £21.1k favourable due to 2 vacancies in Urban Development (£9.1k) which would, hopefully, be filled in October and a vacant post in Craft Development (£14.4k).

b. Donaghadee THI grant payments were £45.5k over budget but that was offset by increased grant income (see 16a below).
c. There were small favourable variances in running costs for Craft Development (£7.3k) and Rural Development (£4.9k).

13. Economic Development - £5.8k favourable. That was mainly due to an underspend of £4.1k on payroll.

14. Planning - £46.1k favourable.
   a. Payroll £45.1k favourable due to vacancies. Three vacant posts were in the process of being filled. It was hoped they would be filled by September.

15. Tourism - £27.8k favourable. The favourable variance was explained by: -
   a. There was a small favourable payroll underspend to date of £4.4k.
   b. There were small favourable variances on running costs for Ards VIC (£2.4k), Bangor VIC (£2.6k), Tourism Marketing (£2.5k), Experience Ards (£2.5k) and Tower House (£1.7k).
   c. The Easter event was £13.9k under budget and the Puppet Festival was £4.4k over budget.

Income - £64.0k (10.8%) better than budget to date. The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following: -

16. Regeneration - £46.7k favourable. That was mainly due to: -
   a. Donaghadee THI grants were £46.9k favourable. The Council had paid out more grant than budget so should receive more grant funding (see 12b above).

17. Economic Development - £6.2k favourable. That was mainly due to Signal Centre income being better than budget to date.

18. Tourism - £11.1k favourable. That was mainly due to the following
   a. Tourism income was £4.1k favourable – there were small favourable variances for Bangor VIC (£1.7k) and Experience Ards (£1.1k).
   b. Events income was £7.0k better than budget to date. There were favourable variances for the Easter event (£1.3k), May Day (£2.0k), Sea Bangor (£2.6k) and Puppet Festival (£1.2k).

FINANCE & PERFORMANCE

Expenditure - £63.6k (3.9%) better than budget to date.

19. Finance & Performance HQ - £33.5k under budget. That was due to a vacant post which was in the process of being filled.

20. Finance - £18.8k under budget. Payroll costs were £21.9k under budget to date.

21. Performance & Projects - £11.3k favourable. Payroll costs were £11.5k under budget to date due to a vacant post which was now being covered by agency.
ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT & ADMINISTRATION

Expenditure - £95.3k (6.1%) better than budget to date. The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following: -

22. Human Resources and Organisational Development - £17.9k favourable which mainly consisted of: -
   a. Payroll was £24.1k favourable. One post was being covered at no cost to Council and 2 administration posts had now been filled.
   b. Recruitment costs were £6.9k adverse. Three assessment centres had been required so far this year which were not budgeted for.

23. Administration & Customer Services - £81.1k favourable which mainly consisted of: -
   a. Payroll was £59.3k favourable due to vacancies within Compliance (£37.6k) and Risk Management (£17.9k) which were in the process of being filled.
   b. Customer Services running costs were £10.3k better than budget to date mainly due to stationary, postage and training spend being less than expected to date.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Expenditure - £31.4k (8.8%) better than budget to date. The favourable variance was mainly due to payroll costs being £29.1k less than budget to date due to vacant posts in Chief Executive’s Office and Corporate Communications. Most of Corporate Communications vacant posts were being covered by agency staff.

NON-SERVICE INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

Income - £266.3k (1.6%) better than budget to date.

24. The Council had been advised by LPS that, based on Quarter 1 information, the 2018/19 rates outturn may result in a positive finalisation of £291.6k. The graph, below, illustrated the trend of previous years APP estimates and finalisations.

In addition, the Council’s estimated Quarter 1 2018/19 De-Rating Grant finalisation was indicating a clawback of £26.4k.
## BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT
By Directorate and Service

**Period 4 - July 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Community &amp; Wellbeing</th>
<th>Environmental Health</th>
<th>Community and Culture</th>
<th>Leisure and Amenities</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing HQ</td>
<td>49,517</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>(183)</td>
<td>160,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>470,219</td>
<td>493,300</td>
<td>(23,081)</td>
<td>1,723,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Community and Culture</td>
<td>560,293</td>
<td>579,700</td>
<td>(19,407)</td>
<td>1,937,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Leisure and Amenities</td>
<td>1,778,125</td>
<td>1,827,100</td>
<td>(48,975)</td>
<td>5,677,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,858,154</td>
<td>2,949,800</td>
<td>(91,646)</td>
<td>9,499,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Environment HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Waste and Cleansing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Assets and Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Regulatory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Regen, Development &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Regen, Dev &amp; Planning HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Econ Dev &amp; Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Finance &amp; Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Performance &amp; Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Org Development &amp; Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>OD &amp; Admin HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>HR &amp; OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Customer Svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Chief Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Corporate Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Non Service Income and Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Year End Transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>District Rates &amp; Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Service Income and Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET COST OF SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,851,534</td>
<td>14,222,500</td>
<td>C (370,960)</td>
<td>44,425,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non Service Income and Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>1,833,998</td>
<td>1,834,000</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3,879,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
<td>(26,153)</td>
<td>(25,400)</td>
<td>(753)</td>
<td>(54,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Year End Transactions</td>
<td>19,173</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>(327)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>District Rates &amp; Grants</td>
<td>(16,837,432)</td>
<td>(16,571,900)</td>
<td>(265,532)</td>
<td>(48,847,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Service Income and Expenditure</td>
<td>(15,010,413)</td>
<td>(14,743,800)</td>
<td>D (266,613)</td>
<td>(52,781,900)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (1,158,879)</td>
<td>B (521,300)</td>
<td>E (637,579)</td>
<td>(8,356,900)</td>
<td>(122.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT

**By Income and Expenditure**

**Period 4 - July 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Actual Income £</th>
<th>Expenditure £</th>
<th>Variance £</th>
<th>Actual Income £</th>
<th>Expenditure £</th>
<th>Variance £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community &amp; Wellbeing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Community &amp; Wellbeing HQ</td>
<td>49,517</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>(183)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Environmental Health</td>
<td>657,356</td>
<td>667,400</td>
<td>(10,044)</td>
<td>(187,137)</td>
<td>(174,100)</td>
<td>(13,037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Community and Culture</td>
<td>903,640</td>
<td>1,111,600</td>
<td>(207,960)</td>
<td>(343,347)</td>
<td>(531,900)</td>
<td>188,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Leisure and Amenities</td>
<td>2,596,227</td>
<td>2,686,300</td>
<td>(90,073)</td>
<td>(818,102)</td>
<td>(859,200)</td>
<td>41,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,206,740</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,515,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>(308,260)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,348,586)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,565,200)</strong></td>
<td><strong>216,614</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Environment HQ</td>
<td>49,864</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Waste and Cleansing Services</td>
<td>4,925,803</td>
<td>4,945,900</td>
<td>(20,097)</td>
<td>(675,330)</td>
<td>(701,200)</td>
<td>25,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Assets and Property Services</td>
<td>1,968,153</td>
<td>1,931,000</td>
<td>37,153</td>
<td>(60,866)</td>
<td>(49,100)</td>
<td>(11,766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Regulatory Services</td>
<td>851,631</td>
<td>884,700</td>
<td>(33,069)</td>
<td>(759,433)</td>
<td>(796,500)</td>
<td>37,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,795,451</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,810,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>(14,549)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,495,629)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,546,800)</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,171</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regen, Development &amp; Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Regen, Dev &amp; Planning HQ</td>
<td>47,068</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Regeneration</td>
<td>405,280</td>
<td>394,800</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>(136,645)</td>
<td>(89,900)</td>
<td>(46,745)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Econ Dev</td>
<td>345,104</td>
<td>350,900</td>
<td>(5,796)</td>
<td>(115,182)</td>
<td>(109,000)</td>
<td>(6,182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Planning</td>
<td>618,927</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>(46,073)</td>
<td>(358,346)</td>
<td>(358,400)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340 Tourism</td>
<td>679,573</td>
<td>725,500</td>
<td>(45,927)</td>
<td>(45,339)</td>
<td>(34,200)</td>
<td>(11,139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,113,951</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,182,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>(68,749)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(655,512)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(591,500)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(64,012)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance &amp; Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Finance &amp; Performance HQ</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>(33,535)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Internal Audit</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420 Finance</td>
<td>562,943</td>
<td>581,700</td>
<td>(18,757)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 Performance &amp; Projects</td>
<td>976,168</td>
<td>987,500</td>
<td>(11,332)</td>
<td>(1,905)</td>
<td>(1,905)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,561,576</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,625,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>(63,624)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,904)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,904)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Org Development &amp; Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 OD &amp; Admin HQ</td>
<td>61,951</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 HR &amp; OD</td>
<td>283,665</td>
<td>301,600</td>
<td>(17,935)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520 Administration &amp; Customer Svcs</td>
<td>1,118,725</td>
<td>1,199,800</td>
<td>(81,075)</td>
<td>(113,003)</td>
<td>(122,000)</td>
<td>8,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,464,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,559,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>(95,259)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(113,003)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(122,000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,997</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 Chief Executive</td>
<td>137,573</td>
<td>148,700</td>
<td>(11,127)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610 Community Planning</td>
<td>53,648</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>(5,852)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620 Corporate Communications</td>
<td>132,888</td>
<td>147,300</td>
<td>(14,412)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>324,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>355,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>(31,391)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET COST OF SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,466,168</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,048,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>(581,832)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3,614,634)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3,825,500)</strong></td>
<td><strong>210,866</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Service Income and Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910 Capital Financing</td>
<td>1,833,998</td>
<td>1,834,000</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920 Bank Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(26,153)</td>
<td>(25,400)</td>
<td>(753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930 Year End Transactions</td>
<td>19,173</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>(327)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940 District Rates &amp; Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16,837,432)</td>
<td>(16,571,900)</td>
<td>(265,532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Service Income and Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,853,171</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,853,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>(329)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(16,863,585)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(16,597,300)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(266,285)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,319,339</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,901,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>(582,161)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20,478,218)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20,422,800)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(55,418)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED that the Committee notes the report.

Alderman Carson remarked that the figures were better this quarter than last. The Head of Finance explained that it was still showing a healthy underspend and work was being carried out on profiling all those matters in an endeavour to keep them under control.

The Officer went on to explain that the financial report got very long as the year progressed. Additional reports were presented to other committees so it was hoped to abbreviate the financial reports to Corporate Committee to highlight the main issues.

Alderman Carson agreed that the simplification of reports made them easier for everyone when making decisions.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Alderman Graham that the recommendation be adopted.

5. SCHEME OF ALLOWANCES OF COUNCILLORS (FILE FIN 23)
(Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 5 September 2018 from the Chief Executive detailing that Regulation 3 of the Payments to Councillors regulations required district councils to prepare and publish a scheme of allowances payable to its Members for each year.

The Department for Communities had issued updated statutory guidance in respect of Payments to Councillors in Circular 23/2016 and provided updated rates for allowances in Circular 12/2018.

The Scheme was substantially the same as version 6 (approved in April), however the following changes had been made:

- Rates and allowances in Section 3 and Schedule 1 had been updated; and
- Section 10 had been simplified to publish on the Council website the annual return made to the Department for Communities. Previously additional analysis of subsistence expenditure and the inclusion of course fees etc had been included.

Both the Scheme of Allowances and the statutory guidance issued by the Department for Communities formed Part 5 of the Council’s constitution and therefore needed updating following approval of the new scheme.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves version 6.1 of the Scheme of Allowances to replace the previous version 6, with effect from 1st April 2018 and updated its constitution accordingly with the new scheme.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Muir, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the recommendation be adopted.
6. **PERFORMANCE REPORT Q1 2018-19**

6 (a) **CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS** *(FILE CCP10118-19)*

(Appendix IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 31 August 2018 from the Chief Executive detailing that Members would be aware that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2018/19 plan published 30 June 2018)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2018)

The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key points to note:**

- During that period staff changes had once again had an impact on the team’s performance; with 40% of posts now being filled by temporary agency workers.

**Key achievements:**

- Significant progress had been made across all service areas in terms of PR planning. That was helping to maximise positive, and minimise negative, PR stories across all directorates.
- Support for tourism events programme resulting in strong regional coverage – traditional media and online.

**Emerging issues:**

• New internal communications initiatives in progress arising from feedback at the engagement sessions e.g. staff business conference, award and recognition scheme.
• Recruitment of permanent staff to posts to ensure effective service delivery.

**Action to be taken:**

• Communications/marketing support for the Belfast Region City Deal – local plan to be implemented in co-ordination with the communications steering group.
• Further communications/marketing support for the delivery of the waste management strategy.
• Delivery and coordination of actions arising from the Resident’s Survey.

The following KPIs were included in the Corporate Communications Service Plan 18/19 but it was considered that those would be best delivered by the new Borough Marketing Manager, which would report to the Head of Tourism.

- Business case approved for borough marketing strategy
- Brief taken to procurement stage for borough marketing strategy

RECOMMENDED that the Council:

1. Notes the report
2. Approves the realignment of the two KPIs above to the Tourism Service Plan.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the recommendations be adopted.

6 (b) **COMMUNITY PLANNING** (Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

• Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
• Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
• Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2017/18 plan published 15 June 2017)
• Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2017)
The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key points to note:**

- Community Planning had a survey (live for 2018/19) to gather continual feedback from the public on the actions being put forward to deliver the Big Plan for Ards and North Down. In addition to that survey the Council engaged directly with its Strategic Partners and members of the 3rd Sector Community Planning Forum. Via the Council’s three Thematic Wellbeing Groups (Social, Economic and Environmental) work had been ongoing to refine and progress the current list of actions. The second half of the year should see an increase in the number of people providing feedback.

- In addition to questions asking the public to prioritise the actions, an additional question on the survey asked if they had previously participated in the Big Conversation and if they had could they see their comments or feedback reflected in the actions. Disappointingly only 40% of respondents stated that they could see their feedback, but when that was analysed of the 10 respondents who said they had previously taken part in the Big Conversation, 4 people said they could see their feedback, 4 people said they were not sure and only 2 people said that their previous feedback was not reflected in the plan. The number of surveys received was too small to make any statistically accurate assessment of them.

**Key achievements:**

- In addition to providing ongoing support for community planning, statistical support was provided to five other services. That included Good Relations, Human Resources, Local Development Plan, Tourism and Equality.

- Performance Scorecards for most of the actions had been completed and ownership of those had been transferred to a number of lead partners (Council colleagues and members of the Thematic Wellbeing Groups)

- Our Community Planning partners continued to report connections they had made as a direct result of participating in the Thematic Wellbeing Groups.
A Strategic Community Planning Partnership workshop was held in June to enable the strategic partners to identify actions they felt should be prioritised by the partnership. A follow up workshop was planned for October.

Emerging issues:

- Guidance had been issued by Department for Communities on monitoring and reporting of community planning. The guidance required community planning partners to publish a statement of progress two years after the publication of the community plan or before November 2019. Ards and North Down’s Strategic Community Planning Partnership would review a draft statement at the December 2018 meeting in time to endorse the final version at the June 2019 meeting. In addition to fulfilling the legislative requirements regarding reporting, the statement of progress would be used to start the review process of the community plan to consider the relevance and accuracy of the indicators originally selected.

Action to be taken:

- Increased engagement with the public to gather feedback on actions within the Delivery Action Sheets. A schedule was being drawn up to identify groups and demographics to engage with and gather feedback from.
- An interactive game, known as the Big Game, was being rolled out to help gather feedback that would be promoted to community organisations as well as youth groups.
- Considerable time and effort would be required to record and measure the impact of actions across all the partners detailed on the performance scorecards.

RECOMMENDED that the Council notes the report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the recommendations be adopted.

6 (c) FINANCE (FIN76) (Appendix VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 4 September 2018 from the Chief Executive detailing that Members would be aware that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2017/18 plan published 15 June 2017)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2017)
The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key achievements:**

- Draft financial statements were submitted on time to the Department for Communities.
- Budget reports were issued to managers within 9-working days of the month end. That represented a 10-day improvement on the same quarter last year.
- Time invested in briefing, training and developing staff was also ahead of target.

**Action to be taken:**

- The implementation of the Purchase to Pay system would commence towards the end of the month, with a view to having a pilot running by early 2019 and then rolled out fully in the Spring.
- Work on developing a new suite of Finance policies had commenced. Consultation papers had been circulated to senior and middle managers on Pricing and Income and Asset Management policy areas. It was expected that initial consultations with regard to Budgeting, Travel and Expenses would follow during the Autumn.
- Comprehensive month-end procedures were currently being developed and it was expected to be operational during the Autumn.

RECOMMENDED that Council notes this report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the recommendations be adopted.

6 (d) **PERFORMANCE AND PROJECTS SERVICE** (Appendix VII)
PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 31 August 2018 from the Director of Finance and Performance detailing that Members would be aware that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook in October 2015. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2018/19 plan published June 2018)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2018)

The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key points to note:**

- The report was for progress against the Service Plan KPIs. It should be noted that some KPIs were reported on a half-yearly or annual basis and may therefore not be reported against in every quarter. All KPIs would be reported against during the course of the reporting year.

**Key achievements:**

- Delivery within financial budget
- Supporting a range of tender exercises during this period to deliver better outcomes and achieve efficiencies
- Achieving full system uptime during this period
- Resolving business technology service calls on target
- Finalisation and publication of the Council’s Performance Improvement Plan within statutory timeframe
• Implementation of managed print service project by Performance Improvement Unit supported by Business Technology Unit. That incorporated the rationalisation of printer stock, removing individual printers and providing modern, faster multi-function devices on more cost-effective contracts. Positive early results had reduced costs by 64% on the same period last year.
• Progression of the Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing & Leisure Complex. All works were currently within budget and progress on site indicated a high standard of design, build, finish and fit-out. Works were programmed to complete by the end of November 2018.
• Progression of portfolio of other projects in development including Belfast Region City Deal projects, Greenways, 3G pitches and multiple PEACE IV projects amongst others.

Emerging issues:

• Cost per head of population higher than target due to profiling of expenditure ie. greater expenditure in Q1 through contract renewal etc. Expected to achieve target over course of the year.
• Proposed ‘pipeline’ meetings (regular internal meetings with senior officers of teams that were current and potential service users to determine future needs) had not yet taken place due to current workload pressures and staff absence. However, there was regular ongoing contact with internal ‘clients’ on a frequent basis and an annual client survey. It was intended to initiate ‘pipeline’ meetings later in 2018/19.
• Below target attendance largely due to long-term absence of one member of staff. Results around Council average (93.5%).
• Progression of reduction in software and hardware variants (rationalisation of technology) slightly behind target though anticipated to achieve target over the course of the year.

Action to be taken:

• None other than above redress of emerging issues.

RECOMMENDED that Council notes this report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Mcllveen, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the recommendations be adopted.
PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 4 September 2018 from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration detailing that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2018/19 plan published 30 June 2018)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2018)

The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

**Reporting approach**

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key points to note:**

- The Information Management (Compliance) Section did not meet its target of responding to requests for information under the FOI Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations 2014 within the statutory timeframe. It was worth noting, however, that the small section received and processed 199 requests in Quarter 1 (a 22% increase on the same period in 2017-18). The requests for information were increasingly complex in nature and the response times relied on cross Directorate co-operation. In this period, a number also required consultation with third parties. Added to that, the section was currently dealing with investigations being carried out by the ICO into complaints from individuals who were unhappy with the information they received. While 6% of information requests did not receive a response until after the statutory time had elapsed, the average response time was 10 days.
Attendance for this quarter fell below the 95% target. 4.56% of the 5.83% staff absence related to long term illness, with two employees suffering from very serious illnesses.

RECOMMENDED that the Council noted the report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the recommendations be adopted.

6 (f) HUMAN RESOURCES (Appendix IX)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 4 September from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration detailing that Council was required, under the Local Government Act 2014, to have in place arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions. To fulfil that requirement Council approved the Performance Management Policy and Handbook. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2018/19 plan published 30 June 2018)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2018)

The Corporate Plan 2015-19 set out 17 objectives for the plan period based on themes of People, Place, Prosperity and Performance. The Council’s 16 Service Plans outlined how each respective Service would contribute to the achievement of the Corporate objectives including, but not limited to, any relevant actions identified in the PIP.

Reporting approach

The Service Plans would be reported to relevant Committees on a quarterly basis as undernoted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reporting Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 (Q1)</td>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report for the first Quarter of 2018/19 was attached.

Key points to note:

- Within the HR and OD Service Plan there were a total of 15 Key Performance indicators, 11 of which were measured every quarter and 4 that were measured annually
In the first quarter, 5 of the KPIs had been met and 6 had not been met.

**Targets Achieved:**

1. 100% of processes had been assessed to ensure that the service was GDPR compliant.
2. The Service was within budget for the first quarter.
3. The majority of key HR and OD policies had been developed and implemented; the service was also working on developing new policies and in reviewing those policies which had been in place for 3 years.
4. The target for absence for the organisation with regard to the number of working days lost per employee with sickness had been met. The target had been set at 12 days. That was a promising start to the year.
5. The target of 25% had been met with regard to the number of staff being made aware of the Organisational Development Strategy and reflected considerable work being carried out to involve people with regard to that.

**Targets which had not been met:**

1. 77% of employees had now been assimilated/recruited into posts within the new Council structures. That was an increase from 72.88% at the end of last year, however was still below the target set. Work was being progressed to ensure that the target was fully met by 31 March 2019.
2. All the existing HR and OD polices were now due for review, that was a lengthy process as all policies needed to be consulted on with trade unions and staff. Work was progressing on that, but was below target for the first quarter.
3. The target of 95% with regard to staff attendance within the HR and OD service had not been met for the first quarter. One member of the team remained on long term absence. That was being managed in line with the Council’s Absence Policy.
4. The target of 5% for absenteeism Council wide had not been met, it currently stood at 6.49%. An action plan was being developed to ensure everything possible was being done to reduce absenteeism.
5. In planning/regeneration/planning and cleansing services, work was progressing to fill structures in those areas. Reports had now been approved by Council with regard to those structures and work was ongoing to establish those.
6. Although work was in progress to complete all the actions on the people plan, the target had not been met for the quarter, however, that should improve significantly as the year progressed.

**Key achievements:**

- Considerable work had taken place within the Resourcing section of HR and OD in the first quarter towards continuing to complete the new Council structures. That involved a great deal of time as each step along the process involved consultation with trade unions and staff. Weekly meetings were taking place with the Director to move the issue forward.
The Employee Relations section continued to deal with a wide range of issues under the Disciplinary/Dignity at Work and Absence Policies.

Work was progressing with regard to the OD strategy and People Plan and planning was underway for some engagement events with staff.

**Emerging issues:**

- The service needed to remain dedicated to ensuring that all employees had been assimilated/matched/recruited into the new Council structures.
- Focus needed to continue to remain on ensuring that our People Plan was met.

**Action to be taken:**

- An Absence Action plan needed to be introduced in an attempt to look at ideas to decrease absenteeism.
- The service would continue to work alongside the Administration Service to ensure the overarching OD strategy for the organisation was implemented.

RECOMMENDED that the Council noted the report.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Councillor Mcllveen, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the recommendation be adopted.

7. **ITEM WITHDRAWN**

8. **ANNUAL IMPROVEMENT AND CORPORATE ASSESSMENT REPORT 2017-18 (FILE 260501)** (Appendix X)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 30 August 2018 from the Chief Executive detailing that the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 put in place a framework to support the continuous improvement in the delivery of Council services in the context of strategic objectives and issues that were important to those who received the services.

To fulfil the requirement Council approved a Performance Management Policy and associated Handbook. The Performance Management Handbook outlined the approach to Performance Planning and Management process as:

- Community Plan – published every 10-15 years
- Corporate Plan – published every 4 years (2015-2019 plan in operation)
- Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – published annually (2018/19 plan published 30 June 2018)
- Service Plan – developed annually (approved April 2018)

Section 92 of the Act placed a requirement on Councils to asses and report on their performance against the previous year and to compare its performance, so far as was practicable, with the performance of other Councils in the exercise of the same
or similar functions. The comparison and assessment report was to be published before 30 September immediately following the financial year to which it related\(^1\).

The purpose of the Performance Report was to review the Council’s performance in the delivery of our agreed Improvement Objectives for the 2017/18 financial year. The intention of the report was to provide a transparent and balanced account of the Council’s position in terms of the priorities agreed in the 2017/18 PIP which aligned with the objectives set out in the Corporate Plan 2015-19.

Council, as in previous years, set itself challenging targets in the 2017/18 PIP and during the reporting process of the 2017/18 PIP it had been evidenced that the indicators/standards selected had not always been suitable, however, learning from this will improve future years’ plans as we continue to develop more effective outcomes based performance measures to demonstrate if people were better off because of the services Council provide.


RECOMMENDATION that this report is adopted.

AGREED, on the proposal on Alderman Girvan, seconded by Alderman Graham, that the recommendation be adopted.

9. LOCAL GOVERNMENT STAFF COMMISSION DISSOLUTION FUNDING AND CONTINUING OPERATIONS 2018-19

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that in April 2018 the Council agreed to pay half of its annual contribution from the Council to the Local Government Staff Commission (LGSC), namely 50% of £29,025, with a further review of the situation in September 2018, given the political uncertainty around the Dissolution Order to wind up the Commission.

Given that there had been no change in the political situation the remaining amount was now due to be paid.

In April it was also agreed that the Council wrote to the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, asking that, in the absence of the Executive, she took the necessary action in order to complete the Dissolution of the Local Government Staff Commission. The letter was sent on 8\(^{th}\) May 2018 but no acknowledgement or response had been received.

RECOMMENDED that Council paid the 50% balance of the requested contribution, namely £14,512.50 by 30 September 2018.
Alderman Carson agreed with the recommendation but questioned the role and value for money for Council. Alderman Graham sensed the lack of sympathy for the Commission but affirmed that on a couple of occasions he had appreciated the contribution the Staff Commission had made to help the Council.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Alderman Graham that the recommendation be adopted.

10. OPERATION LION (FILE CG11911)
(Appendix XI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 3 September 2018 from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration detailing that in May 2017 the Council was reminded of responses by the two legacy Councils to proposals by the Ulster Scots Agency to erect commemorative plaques marking Operation Lion at Bangor and Donaghadee Harbours. The Council agreed at that time to enter into further discussions with the Ulster Scots Agency with a view to exploring options for the positioning of plaques and their wording. It was further agreed that officers bring back a comprehensive report with proposals in due course.

The Council subsequently wrote to the Ulster Scots Agency in July 2017 seeking a meeting to discuss how the initiative might be progressed. A response was received in February 2018 and a meeting convened on 22 February 2018 with a Director of the Ulster Scots Agency.

At the meeting, a number of issues were raised including the following:-
- views expressed by members of legacy Ards Borough Council that the wording of the plaque contained inaccuracies and that the SS Clyde Valley had not in fact docked at Donaghadee Harbour.
- the location of the plaques, given that Donaghadee Harbour was a listed property and Bangor Harbour was operated/managed by Quay Marinas and much of it was built after 1914.
- the requirement for planning permission to be sought at a cost of £831 per application.

The Ulster Scots Agency had confirmed that the historical wording shown on the plaques was researched by the Ulster History Foundation. The Agency provided photographs, dating back to 25 April 1914, which showed a lorry being loaded at Donaghadee Harbour from a lighter, to which guns had been transhipped from the SS Clyde Valley at Larne. The photographs also showed Sir James Craig, who had commanded the operation at Donaghadee, on the quayside. The Ulster Scots Agency was content that the wording on the plaques was historically accurate.

The plaques had already been manufactured and were currently in storage, awaiting installation at suitable sites. The wording on the plaques was therefore not negotiable.

The Ulster Scots Agency had offered to cover the costs of obtaining planning permission and of erecting the plaques, subject to the Council then accepting them as a gift and maintaining them in the future.
The Ulster Scots Agency had also spoken with the Historic Environment Division (Department of Communities) which had advised that it may be possible to attach the plaque to Donaghadee Harbour wall, subject to the acceptability of its location, scale, visual impact and how it would be attached to the wall. An application for Listed Building Consent would be required alongside Planning Permission.

The Ulster Scots Agency was arranging for the location of a plaque on a boulder at Larne Harbour. The Head of Administration had since discussed that with officers from Mid and East Antrim Borough Council who had confirmed that a plaque was erected in 2014 by Larne Borough Council on a boulder at Chain Memorial Road, Larne, to mark Operation Lion, however, the Council took the lead on the project and agreed the wording which read as follows:-

“This plaque was erected by Larne Borough Council to commemorate the centenary of the events surrounding the night of 24 April 1914 - Operation Lion - and appreciates their continuing importance to local history and tradition. Many of those involved, from Larne and across Northern Ireland, would soon serve gallantly in the First World War, giving up their lives for their country.” The Council crest also appeared on the plaque.

Larne Borough Council worked with the Sisters of the Cross and Passion, an order of nuns based at Drumalis, and unveiled the plaque at that location. Drumalis was now a religious retreat but was once owned by the Smylie family who opened their house to Edward Carson during the time of the gun running campaign. While that was a low-key event, it attracted support from all communities and promoted the area’s “shared history”.

**Internal Consultation**

The Head of Administration had consulted with the Head of Property and Assets, the Head of Regeneration, the Compliance Officer (Land) and Planning Officers on suitable sites for the location of the plaques.

**Wording on the Plaques**

The following wording was common to both the Bangor and Donaghadee plaques:-

**Top**

“This plaque was installed by the Ulster-Scots Agency

OPERATION LION

when the Ulster Provisional Government accomplished an audacious mission to arm the Ulster Volunteers to defend the Union with Great Britain. The vital cargo of the SS Clyde Valley was delivered at Larne, Bangor and Donaghadee on 24th and 25th April 1914”.

**Bottom**

“The Exploits of the Gunrunning Night Will Live in History Long After We Have Passed Away” – Sir Edward Carson”

The Plaque for Bangor also reads:

“The SS Clyde Valley arrived in Bangor at 4.25am on 25 April. Colonel T V P
McCammon oversaw the 1,000 men who secured the town before the ship’s arrival. It was reported that 80 tons of equipment was unloaded in just over one hour into cars which had come from as far as Banbridge and Donacloney.

The Plaque for Donaghadee also read:

“The events at Donaghadee were overseen by Sir James Craig whose family lived at Ballyvester House. A smaller steamer, the Innismurray, ferried the cargo from SS Clyde Valley in Larne to the quayside at Donaghadee. 70 tonnes of material was unloaded using the crane which can still be seen here today”.

Equality Screening
The proposals to erect plaques on Council property had been equality screened by the Council’s cross-directorate Internal Screening Group and its External Screening Group which consisted of individuals representing one or more of the nine Section 75 categories.

Both groups expressed the view that the erection of the plaques in principle was acceptable if they served to mark a historical event at the two locations. However, concerns were expressed that the wording on the plaques could potentially have an adverse impact on people of different political opinion.

The Internal Screening Group believed that the wording of the plaque represented opinion rather than fact. The view was also expressed that the plaques should not be erected on Council property as the terms ‘audacious mission’ and ‘vital cargo’ exemplified a biased view of the Gunrunning campaign and that they altered the tone of the text, creating a potential chill factor for people from a nationalist background.

The External Screening Group felt that the wording came across as “very one-sided” and “inappropriate”. They felt that the words “vital” and “audacious” did not leave a very good impression. The view was expressed that the wording was “value laden”, and would not suit all parts of the community.

Should the Council decide to proceed to erect the plaques, the decision may require an Equality Impact Assessment.

RECOMMENDED that, in light of concerns raised through the screening process, the Council reverts to the Ulster Scots Agency stating that it would only be prepared to accept the plaques if they could be produced with amended wording which mitigated against the concerns expressed above.

Councillor McIlveen stated that this was an issue which had been ongoing for some time since the legacy Councils were in existence. He did not see how the wording used could cause a ‘chill’ factor.

Alderman Girvan did not agree and pointed out that some internal and external groups had concerns about the wording. She suggested that the recommendation in the report be supported.
Councillor Kennedy shared Councillor McIlveen’s outlook and thought that nit picking was taking place. He asked Members to look objectively at the matter. Was Operation Lion vital or not? The course of Irish history may have turned to argue it was not vital. Was it audacious? Looking at history were incidences such as the Battle of Dunkirk and others not audacious? He argued that when history was examined it was not always pleasing to everyone so the choice was to accept it for what it was or erase it.

The Head of Administration reminded Members that the legacy Council in Ards had never agreed to a decision to erect the plaques but rather to discuss the matter with the Ulster Scots Heritage Group.

Alderman Graham remarked that the events under discussion had occurred long before anyone in the room had been born and there were various interpretations and feelings surrounding the word audacious.

Councillor Brooks also agreed with Councillor McIlveen, since the events had taken place in history and should be recorded as such.

Alderman Girvan requested a recorded vote be taken on the original wording.

On being put to the meeting, with 7 voting FOR, 2 voting AGAINST, 0 ABSTAINING and 5 were ABSENT, the amendment was declared CARRIED and a decision was made to proceed as was on the original.

A recorded vote resulted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (7)</th>
<th>AGAINST (2)</th>
<th>ABSTAINING (0)</th>
<th>ABSENT (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Girvan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>Muir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcllveen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREED, on the proposal of Councillor Mcllveen, seconded by Councillor Chambers that the original wording be used on the plaques.

11. **ITEM WITHDRAWN**

12. **REQUEST FOR WAYLEAVE MILLS ROAD CAR PARK (FILE LP330)**
    (Appendix XII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration detailing that the Council had received a request from NI Water seeking a wayleave over Council land, as shown on the map, to
facilitate the installation of a new storm sewer. The work would involve the laying of approximately 86 meters of new 150mm UPVC storm sewer piping. The proposed route would involve the closure of 4 parking bays in Abbey Street East Car Park until all works were completed. The proposed route would keep disturbance to the public realm works to a minimum. Council staff had been consulted, and no issues had arisen.

Permission would be subject to NI Water:

- Indemnifying the Council against all claims which may result from the works.
- Reinstating the areas to the satisfaction of the Council's officers.
- Arranging a site meeting with Council Officers prior to the work commencing.

RECOMMENDED that the Council accedes to the request.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the recommendation be adopted.

13. REQUEST FOR WAYLEAVE MILLS ROAD CAR PARK (FILE LP333)
(Appendix XIII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 28 August 2018 from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration detailing that the Council had received a request from NI Water seeking a wayleave over Council land, as shown on a map, to facilitate sewer structural repairs. The work would involve the laying of approximately 20 meters of new 315mm UPVC sewer pipes. The proposed route would involve the closure of 12 parking bays and the relocation of the car park entrance for a 2-day period. A 1.5m walkway would be kept open to ensure pedestrian access to the Hamilton Road Community Hub. Estimated completion time for all works would be 14 days.

Permission would be subject to the following conditions – that NI Water:

- Indemnified the Council against all claims which may result from the works.
- Reinstated the areas to the satisfaction of the Council’s officers
- Arranged a site meeting with Council Officers prior to the work commencing.
- Received approval from the Department of Infrastructure (Roads) in relation to the proposed temporary entrance/exit from the car park.

RECOMMENDED that the Council accedes to the request.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Alderman Graham that the recommendation be adopted.

14. CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS


RECOMMENDED that the information be noted.

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Councillor Chambers that the recommendation be adopted.

14.2 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE – UNDULY LENIENT SENTENCES

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Consultation Document from the Department of Justice detailing a Consultation on Unduly Lenient Sentences.

RECOMMENDED that the information be noted.

Councillor Muir stated that this had been referred to the Corporate Committee and he would be surprised if anyone on the committee would disagree with the sentiments contained in the document. Councillor McIlveen suggested that everyone would have their own views on it and therefore suggested that political parties individually respond to the document.

AGREED, on the proposal of Councillor Muir, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that the recommendation be adopted.

15. NOTICES OF MOTION

15.1 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Muir

That this Council agrees that officers should collate and publish on the Council website in a simple and easy to understand manner member attendance statistics for Full Council and all Standing Committee meetings. Statistics to be updated on a quarterly basis with historical attendance information from 1 April 2015 included.

Proposed by Councillor Muir, seconded by Alderman Girvan that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

Councillor Muir thought that elected Councillors had a responsibility not only to articulate concerns of their constituents but to ensure good governance within the Council. He stated that that was primarily done by engaging with officers via the established Committee structure and full Council meetings, the reviewing of papers, asking of questions, debating the issues and reaching robust evidence based decisions.

While he accepted that attendance alone did not give a full picture of Councillor performance a remuneration of over £14,000 per year must be accompanied with some openness about which Committees the Councillor was a member of and when they attended.
He therefore proposed the Motion to ensure the public had a more open and transparent understanding of Councillor attendance figures rather than having to rely upon Freedom of Information legislation to obtain the data when the need arose. He hoped all other Councillors would support his proposal without hesitation.

Responding to the Notice of Motion Councillor McIlveen had no difficulty with the proposal however he did urge caution on how figures were read and interpreted. He gave an example of Councillor Robinson who did not sit on any committees through no fault of her own. A person viewing information could come to a wrong conclusion as to her input to Council. He felt a record of apologies also needed to be considered for recording purposes. While those were small concerns they could be ironed out and he had no intention of undermining the Motion.

Alderman Graham agreed with a little concern, he understood that at times in a person’s life they could be overtaken with issues which could make attendance for them difficult. He cautioned that bare statistics did not always tell a whole story. Foot notes, and explanations could be built in to the information to protect it from being a simplistic and harsh measure of performance.

While Councillor Chambers was sympathetic he also noted that a person was free to attend the start of the meeting and then simply leave after the attendance was recorded.

Alderman Carson asked everyone to consider the work involved in collating the information against the numbers of people who would be interested in reading it.

Councillor Gilmour reminded members that that information was recorded already. She added as an example that Councillors did not receive maternity leave or paternity leave either and that would be inbuilt in to attendance figures.

In summing up Councillor Muir said that he could see the value in all the comments made. At this point he asked that a report be brought to Council taking on board the comments made. He said that he would be prepared to add “including apologies” to his Notice of Motion.

AGREED that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

15.2 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Woods and Councillor Menagh

That this Council writes to the Department of Work and Pensions urging that a review takes place on how people with terminal illnesses are assessed for welfare under Personal Independence Payments, with the focus on the six month rule.

This item was deferred to the October meeting of the Corporate Committee.

AGREED.

15.3 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Muir
That this Council acknowledges the positive contribution that diversity brings to our communities and accordingly affirms that all lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans people living, working or visiting our Borough should be accepted and valued as equal citizens as part of a safe, welcoming inclusive society. Council consequently requests that officers explore how we can positively fulfil this pledge including via suitable events.

Proposed by Councillor Muir, seconded by Councillor Walker as an amendment.

That this Council acknowledges the positive contribution that diversity brings to our communities and accordingly affirms that all lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans people living, working or visiting our Borough should be accepted and valued as equal citizens as part of a safe, welcoming and inclusive society. Council consequently requests that officers bring back a report on how we can positively fulfil this pledge including via lighting of Ards Town Hall in Rainbow Colours to coincide with Pride Day each year on the first Saturday of August.

Councillor Muir began by saying that he presented his Motion in the hope that the Council could make a positive difference to the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people living, working or visiting the Borough by affirming they should be accepted and valued just like everyone else.

Throughout the history of the Council it had made many pledges to support different causes and stand by various minorities but to date it had not reached out the hand of friendship to LGBT people.

He urged the Council to make history as the first Council in Northern Ireland to make such an affirmation and provide the much needed local leadership to ensure that nobody felt that being LGBT was something to be disappointed about or ashamed of.

Northern Ireland had travelled a long way in recent years. In 1982 homosexuality was still illegal. Today, however, it was not only legal but the man who overturned the discrimination via a landmark case at the European Court of Human Rights served as an elected member of Belfast City Council.

He gave a personal account of finding it difficult to believe that he was now an elected representative, something that he often found difficult to comprehend when he considered what he had written in 1996:

“Before I start writing this letter I think it is necessary to make some things clear. I have NEVER talked to anyone about being gay and would appreciate complete confidentiality. I have made arrangements that I shall not have to return home from the University of Sunderland once I enter in September.”

He said that he had left for Sunderland and had tried to hide his sexuality from his family and friends but he was proud that he eventually picked up the courage to tell others, come back to Northern Ireland and made North Down his home once again. The stories he had heard had been heart-breaking and frankly had moved him to propose the Motion he was speaking about. From a friend whose only way to cope was to commit suicide to a previous partner beaten nearly to death by homophobic
thugs, trans friends openly mocked in the street because of who they were or a number of people who continued to hide their sexuality from family and work colleagues for fear of the response.

He believed that to be wrong and said that the Council had an opportunity as civic leaders to make a positive pro-active statement of support making it clear that diversity made a real positive contribution to our communities.

He said that he recognised and accepted that some people may hold different personal views, particularly those who thought about the issue from a religious perspective, however, the right to be valued and treated equally as part of a safe, welcoming and inclusive society regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity was a basic request. He hoped that the Motion would obtain unanimous support especially considering the recent words from both the Leader of the DUP and Ulster Unionist Party when they spoke at the Pink News event on 28th June this year.

He acknowledged the help he had received from the Rainbow Project and Stonewall in drafting the wording of the Motion which had been slightly amended to include the lighting of Ards Town Hall in Rainbow Colours to coincide with Pride Day.

The technology was already in place to light Ards Town Hall in Rainbow Colours and that would serve as a practical and tangible way to fulfil the pledge given and should, he hoped, form part of the officers report along with any pertinent issues if the Motion was passed.

In conclusion he asked the Council to make history and back the motion for the sake of everyone whether they be gay or straight, male or female or whatever, to embrace diversity and look forward to a brighter and Rainbow coloured future.

Alderman Graham thanked Councillor Muir for his Motion and asked if he could propose an amendment.

“This Council acknowledges the many positive contributions from residents of our Borough and also of people working and visiting the Borough regardless of their sexual orientation, and will continue to run events open to all.”

The amendment was seconded by Alderman Keery.

Alderman Graham said that he was bewildered by the Motion. He said that often he was known to speak out of turn but he had never asked anyone about their sexuality or told them about his. He preferred to see people as simply people and despised the notion of putting them in to pigeon holes. Over his lifetime he had worked with people he perceived to be of a different sexual orientation to him and those people were welcomed by him and others. He found that uniting behind this type of Motion was more likely to divide rather than unite. He was just not happy to earmark people or tag them according to their sexuality.

Councillor Smith said that he had no problem with the Motion – everyone was different and it was that difference that brought colour and variety to life.
In response Councillor Muir said that he could not support Alderman Graham’s amendment because of the real life experiences of LGBT people including his own. He viewed the amendment as nothing but a wrecking Motion however he thanked Councillor Smith for his comments.

Alderman Girvan asked for a recorded vote on Alderman Graham’s amendment. On being put to the meeting, with 5 voting FOR, 6 voting AGAINST, 0 ABSTAINING and 3 ABSENT, the amendment was declared LOST.

A recorded vote resulted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (5)</th>
<th>AGAINST (6)</th>
<th>ABSTAINING (0)</th>
<th>ABSENT (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Keery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>McIlveen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original Notice of Motion became the substantive motion.

Councillor Brooks told the committee that he was an openly gay man. He had come to the Borough in 1985 where he had bought a home, opened a business, joined a church and other organisations and integrated into society. He explained that he had never encountered the issues that Councillor Muir had and he was sorry to hear that others had. He had been accepted in Donaghadee and his sexuality had not come in to it. The practice of homosexuality had been illegal when he was serving in the army and he had shared many of the same life experiences as other gay men but he felt it was time for unity, inclusiveness and integration. He completely understood and very much respected Alderman Graham’s position but he supported the Motion as it was originally presented by Councillor Muir.

Councillor Chambers was angered and felt disgust that some people still suffered and he felt that the Motion would be a positive thing for the Borough to embrace.

Alderman Girvan was happy to support and thanked Councillor Muir for bringing the Motion. She thanked those who had spoken of their personal experiences very much for being so honest. She respected Alderman Graham’s views but thought that a more positive affirmation needed to be made to the LGBT community to make it clear that it was welcomed.

Councillor McIlveen began by saying that he had not intended to make a contribution on the Motion but had been moved by the words of Councillors Muir and Brooks. There were now very few people in society who did not want it to be equal and inclusive where everyone was treated equally and without discrimination. Discrimination could happen to anyone and it took many forms. He cautioned that
we should not be judged or highlighted for our differences but consideration needed to be given to how we could move forward together to create a fairer society.

In summing up Councillor Muir thanked everyone for their comments in what had proven to be a respectful debate. He respected the different views of other Councillors many of whom he considered to be friends. He acknowledged that the long term desire was a society blind to identity but the reality was still different. It was incumbent on Council to provide leadership to reach out to LGBT people after all they had experienced and make it clear they were valued as equal citizens.

Alderman Girvan called for a recorded vote the results of which were shown below.

On being put to the meeting, with 6 voting FOR, 5 voting AGAINST, 0 ABSTAINING and 3 ABSENT, the Notice of Motion was declared CARRIED.

A recorded vote resulted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (6)</th>
<th>AGAINST (5)</th>
<th>ABSTAINING (0)</th>
<th>ABSENT (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girvan</td>
<td>Keery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Gilmour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Kenney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir</td>
<td>McIlveen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREED, that the Notice of Motion as amended be adopted.

15.4 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Robinson

Following on from the launch of the very popular JAM card, this Council will support the roll-out of Headway Brain Injury Card in our Borough, to help all those dealing with brain injury, which can often be an invisible disability.

Proposed by Councillor Robinson, seconded by Councillor Muir.

Councillor Robinson began by stating that many would be aware that she had suffered an Acquired Brain Injury in March 2011, when an aneurysm in her brain had suddenly ruptured.

After receiving excellent care in the Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast, she returned home to start the process of recuperation and rehabilitation. It took a while along with a lot of determination but she felt fortunate to be in the category termed 'high functioning' having managed to adapt to the changes caused by her brain injury fairly well.

She was fortunate to have been able to resume and continue with her daily life, and most people whom she came in to contact with would have no idea that she had an Acquired Brain Injury.
The complexities of brain injury, however, could make it difficult for people to ask for support. Carrying her Headway Brain Injury Card provided her with the confidence of knowing that if she needed help, her needs and issues could be easily identified, whether in social situations, or should she happen to come into contact with police or other emergency services. Each card was personalised for each carrier through the application process.

She reminded Members that she had served with the PSNI, and it was through that connection that she became aware of the Brain Injury card about two years ago, before its general release in Northern Ireland. At that time, it was being trialled in mainland United Kingdom.

The card was supported by the National Police Chief’s Council in England and Wales, by Police Scotland and now by the Police Service of Northern Ireland too.

Police came in to contact with the general public at all times of the day and night, and those of us with brain injuries could also be out and about at those hours. Many continued to enjoy a social life, but due to brain injury, they could be mistaken for being drunk, incapable or on drugs for example.

If a person carried the card, it would help both them and the police to understand each other better, should the person become involved with them. The card also provided the holder with details of a freephone number, where 24hr legal assistance could be obtained if it was required.

Members would be familiar with the JAM card and the brain injury card was similar, but the difference was that it was personalised for each holder, indicating their particular issues, as well as being recognised and endorsed by police services across the United Kingdom. As the flyer said, it provided ‘A Simple Solution to a Tricky Situation’.

Councillor Robinson explained that she would be eternally grateful to have survived so well since many others did not. Her request was simple, that the Council endorsed and promoted awareness of the Headway Brain Injury Card throughout the Borough. There would be no cost to the Council, indeed, Headway had kindly sent her a quantity of flyers and posters free of charge, but for those who had suffered brain injury, the benefits of carrying the card were priceless.

Councillor McIlveen asked if he could clarify a few points. He referred to JAM cards which were a good idea and wondered if there would be merit in combining the cards. Councillor Robinson agreed but pointed out that the brain injury card was personalised and this was asking for patience perhaps sometimes more than just a minute. Councillor McIlveen was happy to support but stated that he would prefer to see a more unified approach.

AGREED that the Notice of Motion be adopted.

15.5 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Douglas
That this Council undertakes to write to the Department of Health to seek to implement the Regional Trauma Network in its entirety, as agreed in the Stormont House Agreement, December 2014.

In the absence of Councillor Douglas it was agreed to defer the Notice of Motion until the next month’s meeting.

AGREED.

15.6 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Douglas

This Council notes the importance of Personal Independence Payments to sustaining and maintaining the lives of many across Northern Ireland: notes with concern the many issues associated with undergoing of assessments and the stress they can bring upon individuals; is concerned at the fall in figures of those receiving the benefit and the impact this is having on their lives; notes the link that exists between the drop in support provided that the ‘20m rule’ for the highest rate of PIP mobility support as highlighted by ‘PIP – a step too far’ published by MS Society; and, will write to the Minister for Work and Pensions to urgently review the 20m rule and engage with key stakeholders to find a more appropriate alternative.

In the absence of Councillor Douglas it was agreed to defer the Notice of Motion until the next month’s meeting.

AGREED.

EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Alderman Keey, that the public/press be excluded during the discussion of undernoted items of confidential business.

16. **SPFG MINUTES DATED 28 JUNE 2018**
(Appendix XIV)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

17. **NEWTOWNARDS MARKET CROSS (FILE PCU)**
(Appendix XV)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).
18. ARRANGEMENTS FOR GROOMSPORT REMEMBRANCE SERVICE 2018  
(Appendices XVI, XVII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

RECESS 9.05 pm  
RESUMED 9.20 pm

(Councillor Kennedy left the meeting at 9.05 pm)

19. OPEN SPACE AT AMBLESIDE

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

20. EXTENSION OF LEASE OF LAND AT BLOOMFIELD PLAYING FIELDS

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

21. LEASE OF LAND ADJACENT TO EXPLORIS TO AEL LTD (LP)  
(Appendix XVIII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

22. LEASE OF LAND AT MANOR STREET, DONAGHADEE (LP329)  
(Appendix IXX)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).
23. **REQUEST FROM INLER ANGLING CLUB TO PLACE A STORAGE CONTAINER AT COMBER LEISURE CENTRE CAR PARK, COMBER (LP313)**
   (Appendices XX, XXI)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

24. **REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO LICENCE CROMELIN WOOD, DONAGHADEE (LP161)**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

25. **REQUEST FOR LEASE AT COOK STREET JETTY, PORTAFERRY (FILE LP332)**
   (Appendix XXII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

26. **REQUEST FROM CLANDEBOYE GOLF CLUB TO PURCHASE COUNCIL LAND AT SLIDING ROCK, CONLIG (LP218)**
   (Appendix XXIII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

27. **VOLUNTARY SERVERENCE APPLICATIONS WITH ARDS LEISURE CENTRE**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

28. **MEMBER DEVELOPMENT CHARTER PLUS UPDATE (FILE DIR/ADM4)**
   (Appendices XXIV, XXV)
29. **REPLIES TO NOTICES OF MOTION**

29.1 **SERVICE PLANNING AND ESTIMATES PROCESS (FIN130)**

30. **ANY OTHER NOTIFIED BUSINESS**

**RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREEED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Girvan, seconded by Councillor Muir, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

**TERMINATION OF MEETING**

The meeting terminated at 9.46 pm.

**Circulated for Information**

(a) E Mail from Eamonn McConville. Secretary to the Boundary Commission for Northern Ireland
## Newtownards Town Centre Steering Group Meeting Minutes

**11 September 2018**  |  **5:30pm**  |  **Ards Arts Centre, Newtownards**
--- | --- | ---
**Attendees**  |  |  
Alderman Alan McDowell, ANDBC  
Councillor Colin Kennedy, ANDBC  
Stanley Lamb, Department for Infrastructure - Roads  
Niall McVitty, Department for Communities  
Brian Dorrian, Head of Regeneration, ANDBC  
Gillian Corbett, Planning Officer, ANDBC  
Rowena Moore – Administrative Assistant, ANDBC

### Agenda Item 1
**Apologies**

Councillor Katherine Ferguson, ANDBC  
Councillor Stephen McIlveen, ANDBC  
Councillor Naomi Armstrong-Cotter, ANDBC  
David Shivers, ANDBC

### Agenda Item 2
**Declarations of Interest**

**Discussion**

None declared

### Agenda Item 3
**Regeneration Projects**

**Discussion**

The Head of Regeneration advised that funding was now available to do some additional public realm works to streets that abut the main shopping area. He asked N McVitty, from DfC, to provide some further information. Mr McVitty gave the back ground
regarding the upgrading of a number of laneways in Newtownards.

S Lamb reported that he and David Shivers (ANDBC) had previously assessed the area and discussed better connections between Newtownards town centre and the town perimeter.

A number of roads were found to be presently in poor condition and subsequently B Dorrian, N McVitty and S Lamb developed a project for addressing this. The roads are Ann Street, Brewery Lane, Mary Street, Meetinghouse Lane, North Street and Price’s Lane, which lead towards the town centre and are therefore seen as important conduits for access to the main shopping area.

The project will involve resurfacing and the replacement of the old curbs with new granite curbs. S Lamb advised that the exact granite, which was previously used in the Newtownards Public Realm scheme, was no longer available as the quarry, this was sourced from, has since closed. S Lamb has instead been provided with a sample of a different type of granite from the contractor, which is similar in tone but not exactly the same.

S Lamb brought the new sample of granite along with a sample of the previously used granite for the Members to view and compare and to consider the new granite colour and texture and decide if it is suitability for inclusion in new the public realm works.
The Members were told that new granite curbs with the street names engraved on them would be positioned at the entrance to each street.

S Lamb advised that there is a 12-16-week lead-in period to source the granite, as the quarry is based in China and would therefore ideally like to place an order within the next week to allow the resurfacing works to commence as soon as possible.

N McVitty stated that the approval of the Town Steering Group is being sought for this project this evening, has he only has until the following day to meet the internal transfer process or the funding will be reallocated.

S Lamb reported that the projected works will cost £105,000. N McVitty and B Dorrian confirmed that 90% of the costs will be provided from the Department for Communities and 10% will be provided by the Council from existing budgets.

B Dorrian wished to emphasise that, although similar, there are slight differences between the types of granite and wanted the Members to be sure they were happy to accept this, before the project works are initiated.

Alderman McDowell noted that some of the granite in the current public realm has oil stains and queried if this can be addressed. S Lamb stated that the granite should be treated beforehand to avoid stains seeping into the stonework.
**ACTION:** B Dorrian agreed to raise the issue of the regularity of street cleaning with David Lindsay (Head of Environment, ANDBC).

The two Members present **AGREED** that they were happy to grant approval for the project to proceed based on the new granite sample shown to them and on the project costs as stated above.

**ACTION:** N McVitty to proceed with the agreement with S Lamb to begin the project works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 4</th>
<th>Any Other Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td>B Dorrian noted that his team are still looking at the possibility of further Public Realm schemes in Newtownards for the next financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Dorrian also noted that David Shivers (Urban Development Manager) has been off sick for some time now and was not sure when he would return. The Members wished to pass on their regards to David.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 5</th>
<th>Date and Time of Next Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td>B Dorrian suggested that further meetings would be held on an ad-hoc basis as and when needed course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjournment</strong></td>
<td>The meeting ended at 6:00pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Community and Wellbeing Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Wednesday, 12 September 2018 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor Woods

Aldermen: Irvine
           Smith

Councillors: Adair  Dunne
             Boyle  Martin
             Brooks McAlpine
             Chambers Muir
             Douglas (8.18pm) Thompson

Officers: Director of Community and Wellbeing (G Bannister), Head of Leisure and Amenities (I O’Neill), Head of Environmental Health, Development and Protection (M Potts), Externally Funded Programme Manager (N Dorrian), Community Development Manager (K Marshall), Leisure & Amenities Administrative Officer (E Gregson) and Democratic Services Officer (P Foster)

Others: Councillor J Gilmour

1.  APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend were received from Councillors Cooper, Edmund, Kennedy, Menagh and Smart.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Douglas.

NOTED.

2.  DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman asked for any declarations of interest and none were made at this stage.

NOTED.
3. DEPUTATIONS

3.1 Caring Communities Safe and Well (Appendix I)

The Chairman welcomed Sandra Glover, Health and Development Specialist at Caring Communities Safe & Well, to the meeting and invited her to make her deputation.

Ms Glover thanked members for the opportunity to speak to them about Caring Communities, Safe and Well and proceeded to guide members through a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms Glover commented that as the population aged and more people were living alone, and social isolation and loneliness amongst older people were emerging as two of the major issues affecting individual health, wellbeing and independence. Therefore, the need for the Caring Communities Safe & Well Service had been identified as chronic loneliness affected about 10% of older people. This equated to approximately 6,500 people over 65 years in the SEHSC Trust area and 10-17% of older people were socially isolated, which was between 6,500 and 11,000 people. In the Ards & North Down area it was noted there were approximately 3,300 older people who were lonely and up to 5,500 socially isolated.

Caring Communities Safe and Well aimed to help people aged 65 and over tackle those issues by offering information, advice and support to access a wide range of services that would help promote safe, healthier, independent living. The service which would operate across Ards, North Down, Lisburn and Down and had been jointly funded, recurrently, by the Local Commissioning Group and Public Health Agency. The staffing structure included a manager; three CC Officers, one VBO and one Administrator.

The Caring Communities service was made up of four key components:

1. Personal needs assessment and goal setting
2. Referral and signposting
3. Volunteer Befriending
4. Small grants of up to £500 (Groups)

Criteria for the service was as detailed below:

- Live in the SEHSCT
- Age 65 +
- Be socially isolated or lonely
- Dementia (mild stages)

Members were advised that health professionals, C&V sector, self-referral/family and churches could all refer patients to the scheme. It was noted referrals could be made via telephone, email, a referral form and i-connect.
Ms Glover informed members that the referral and signposting component was subdivided into seven key themes, detailed below:

1. **Health** – GP, Physio, OT, Sensory impairment…
2. **Healthy living** – PA – Active Ageing Programme, Healthy eating, stop smoking service, alcohol and you service and mental health and wellbeing
3. **Social participation** – GMC, Befriending, OP Social groups, floating support, LWLL,
4. **Getting out and about** – DATS, RCTS, Vol driver, Translink smart pass
5. **Safe secure homes** – NIHE, Secure services, Home safety / fire safety checks, affordable warmth, oil clubs
6. **Money matters** – CAB, CAP, Benefit advice line, carers assessment
7. **General information and advice**

At this stage Ms Glover referred to social isolation and loneliness and advised of the following services offered:

- Good Morning Call
- The Silver Line
- Older Peoples Groups – POP NI
- Befriending
- Transport

It was noted the Volunteer Befriending was also available and currently there were 40 volunteer befrienders visiting 42 service users. Ms Glover added that in North Down & Ards there were 15 Volunteer Befrienders visiting 15 Service Users on a weekly basis.

Criteria for Volunteer Befriending included:

- Lives Alone
- Socially Isolated
- Feels Lonely
- Limited contact with family, friends or neighbours

Ms Glover stated that Volunteer Befriending offered:

- Chat & Companionship
- Support to attend social group activity
- Volunteer Driver

At this stage Ms Glover referred members to Outcomes Based Accountability and outlined the Reporting Structure and Measurement Tools. Members were also shown provided with an overview of what had been achieved during 2017-2018 and what service users had said.

Continuing she noted that people were living longer than ever before, and the proportion of older people within society was growing. Northern Ireland had the fastest growing older people’s population in the UK, which currently stood at
approximately 300,000 people aged 65 and over. In the South Eastern Trust area that figure equated to approximately 64,000 people aged 65 and over.

Ms Glover stated that this was a cause for celebration. However, population ageing, with the fastest rise in the ‘oldest old’, meant that the overall number of people in society with health or care needs had risen. This trend held new responsibilities and challenges for Health and Social Care services in helping older people stay healthy, active and independent for as long as possible. The adoption of healthy lifestyles and actively participating in one’s own care were important regardless of age and it was never too late to adopt such life styles in the later years.

Ms Glover concluded that engaging in appropriate physical activity, healthy eating, not smoking and using alcohol and medications wisely could prevent disease and functional decline, extend longevity and enhance one’s quality of life.

The Chairman thanked Ms Glover for her informative presentation and invited questions from members.

Several members rose in support and with questions and the following responses were given:

- Councillor Adair thanked Ms Glover for her presentation adding that he had been encouraged by it particularly as he was aware loneliness was a big issue throughout the local community. He asked Ms Glover how the Trust promoted the service to those in the local community.
- In response, Ms Glover advised that promotion took place at a local level by way of flyers left at GP Practices and pharmacies. The Trust also worked in Partnership with AGENDA and similar agencies as well as SERC and Queens University, Belfast.
- Alderman Smith acknowledged the valuable work which was carried out by volunteers adding that services such as this were great for socialisation for those who were lonely. She asked whether or not it would deal with requests for house alterations for tenants, such as kitchen or bathroom refurbishments.
- Ms Glover advised that the service offered Occupational Therapy, Falls Prevention Assistance and Hearing Impairment Assistance. She added that in most cases Occupational Therapy would go out and assess an individual and their needs and report back to the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) if alterations were required. Ms Glover also stated that officers were aware of the range of groups out there in the Community and would visit them periodically to provide appropriate information.
- Alderman Irvine noted the links to an Active and Healthy lifestyle and asked if any links had been established with the local leisure centres.
- Ms Glover confirmed that the Trust was linked into the Active Aging Programme at local leisure centres and those sessions were aimed at encouraging people to remain active and consider their dietary and drinking habits.
- Councillor McAlpine noted that Ards and North Down Borough had an aging population and asked where that could potentially leave the service.
- In response Ms Glover emphasised the importance of securing volunteers at a local level and added that it was necessary to start the process of growing the concept of volunteering within society at school age level.
• Councillor Martin acknowledged that social inclusion and health were both very important factors and sought clarification on current volunteer numbers.
• Ms Glover stated that volunteers could be a challenge to secure at times hence the need for change within society and embedment of the ethos behind volunteering at schools.

The Chairman thanked Ms Glover for her presentation.

The deputation withdrew from the meeting at this stage – 7.44pm

3.2. **Kilcooley Womens Centre** (Appendix II)

The Chairman welcomed Alison Blayney and Tracey Harrison, to the meeting and invited them to make their deputation.

Ms Blayney thanked members for the opportunity to speak to them about Kilcooley Womens Centre (KWC) and its proposals for its SEUPB Peace IV ICON Centre and proceeded to guide members through a PowerPoint presentation which would outline the following:

- Background to KWC
- Overview of project
- Project Impact
- Our Request from ANDBC
- Risks / Constraints
- Questions

**Background to Kilcooley Women’s Centre**

- Formed in 1995 by five volunteers (23 years)
- Based in Kilcooley Primary School, reaching out to the Peninsula
- Transcended the Community, Straddles Urban/Rural
- Includes three fully registered Childcare Units – Ladybirds Childcare
- Wrap around support for Women, Children & Families
- Wide range of adult/community education programmes
- Lead partner in the Kilcooley Health Task Force
- Jellietots – Baby Room (birth – 2 years)
- Smarties – Pre-Pre Nursery (2-3 years)
- Magic Stars – Pre-Nursery (3-4)

All financed by a cocktail of funders.

**KWC Services / Programmes**

- 24 Staff/Trainers/Assessors & Internal Quality Assurance
- 20 associate tutors
- 6 fields of work / education
  - To improve the outcomes of local people to consolidate peace
  - Education, Training & Employability
  - Volunteering Programme – Accredited & EU
Ms Blayney advised that KWC offered a range of programmes, many of which were delivered in house, through its staff team. They worked with the main UK awarding bodies which enabled them to offer a suite of training opportunities, which delivered high level impact for the participants. Whilst based in Kilcooley Primary, they worked extensively across the Borough, and had a strong partnership with County Down Rural Network, which enabled them to cross the urban/rural divide and strengthen the cross community links within the Borough. She commented that there was a tendency to look to Belfast for Cross Community work, however she reiterated that they worked across the UK and had a close working relationship with Salford Council and Cambrige County Council in the UK.

Ms Blayney also informed members that KWC worked extensively internationally, and currently was working with Italy, Romania, Bulgaria, Spain, Netherlands, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Estonia, Greece, Austria, Finland, Latvia and Turkey.

**ICON Centre – Overview**

The ICON Centre concept had been in development since 2010 when an options appraisal identified a lack of shared space within the Bangor and surrounding areas. The project had been developed by KWC but was supported by a range of key local and regional stakeholders including Ards and North Down Borough Council, South Eastern Trust, PHA, DfC and NIHE.

The Centre would create a multi-functional and inclusive community-based facility that could help to bridge division and build relationships for local residents and communities across the Bangor and wider Ards North Down region. The ICON centre would also help to connect the community, statutory and business community at a local level and provide opportunities for social and economic development.

The Icon Centre aimed to:

“develop an iconic and shared multi-functional centre that can connect all communities, businesses and people through the provision of high quality facilities and opportunities for sustained cross community engagement”

Ms Blayney informed members that KWC had been working on this project since 2010, initially through Neighbourhood Renewal following which a Council Feasibility study had been carried out, and options recommended. As part of that process a lack of shared space had been identified. KWC had been working with other statutory bodies, including Department for Communities, Housing Executive, SE Trust and Public Health Agency.
Ms Blayney stated that the project had the potential not only to deliver a fantastic iconic building for the Borough based upon a centre of excellence for good relations but could also be used as a vehicle to deliver Community Planning, support citizens of the Borough from birth through its first-class early years programme and childcare facility. It could also develop and support social economy business and innovation, build the skills and employability potential of young people, be a family support and community wellbeing hub and give tangible support to victims and survivors many of whom now resided in the Borough.

In summary Ms Blayney stated that they hoped to develop an iconic and shared multi-functional centre that could connect all communities, businesses and people through the provision of high quality facilities and opportunities for sustained cross community engagement.

The 2x storey multi-functional ICON Centre (46,845sq ft. / 4,352sq m. in total) would provide the following core facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creche / Childcare provision (3,045sq ft.)</td>
<td>Flexible office space (6,082sq ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Units (6,694sq ft.)</td>
<td>Training and classrooms (2,901sq ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café (2,062sq ft.)</td>
<td>Health and Wellbeing Wing (1,225sq ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym (2,080sq ft.)</td>
<td>Exhibition Room (1,051sq ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference rooms (3,993sq ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total cost of the capital development was €9,746,040.26 (including VAT) while a revenue / programming budget of €334,189.03 had been developed to provide high quality cross community and shared space programmes at the Centre once operational.

A number of key staff posts would be created as part of the proposal which would include a Project Manager, Community Relations Officer as well as functional staff to support the day to day management of the facility to include a General Manager, Finance and Administration Officer and Reception Staff.

It was noted the ICON bid was the only proposal from the Borough.
Project Impact

At this stage Ms Blayney outlined the SMART activity and programming targets as detailed below:

- Delivery of daily cross community childcare services which would include provision for 72 full time and part time spaces (100+ young people aged 0-4)
- Delivery of an annual 3-week cross community Summer Scheme programme which would engage approx. 100 children and young people aged 0-4 per annum
- Delivery of an afterschools / homework club for 30 children and young people aged 5-11 daily commencing March 2022 (could engage up to 80 different young people per year)
- Delivery of a 4 quarterly cross community youth fun day events which would engage approx. 120 young people aged 5-11 per event (480 young people per year)
- Establishment of an Ards and North Down Cross Community Network engaging with a minimum of 30 local community-based organisations
- Delivery of a Cross Community Fun day engaging 600 people of all ages and backgrounds annually
- Delivery of an annual Connecting Older People’s Programme to engage 50 older people (aged 50+) across the Borough Council
- Delivery of an annual Shared Space Cross Community Capacity Building and Training Programme delivering accredited and non-accredited courses for approx. 200 participants aged 16 -30 annually
- Delivery of 2 Shared Schools / Education Programmes engaging with 16 local schools across the Ards and North Down Borough Council area and approx. 320 young people in total achieve a target of at least 40,000 people using the facility annually which at least 10,000 should be unique users. This would include all elements of the facility for example retail units, offices, childcare and training rooms.

The proposal offered a considerable strategic alignment with local, regional and national policy including the Together Building a United Community (TBUC), ANDBC Good Relations Strategy, ANDBC Community Plan and a range of childcare, educational, employment and health related priorities.

The project provided a unique opportunity for the Borough to build on its reputation as an innovator in good community relations, and importantly, to address major deficits in infrastructure in relation to affordable childcare, training space, office space, business / retail units and other multi-functional activities. The project could deliver an iconic facility for the development of good relations whilst making a major contribution to collective efforts for regional economic growth, regional physical development and regional community and social –wellbeing of its citizens.

This would be the last opportunity to secure a major investment of €10,000,000 for the Borough. In the current state of the public finances, such an opportunity would not present itself again in the medium to long term future.
**Project Outcomes**

- Establish an iconic and accessible shared space that could connect all communities within the Ards and North Down Borough Council area
- Create shared space facilities that could connect people, communities and businesses together
- Connect urban and rural communities across the Ards and North Down Borough Council area through the provision of multi-functional facilities
- Increase and improve the cross community and shared opportunities for people throughout the Ards and North Down Borough Council area
- Provide facilities that could provide cross community and cross cutting benefits to address key social issues such as the provision of affordable childcare, employment, education, health and training.
- Provide additionality and complement existing provision within Ards and North Down Borough Council through the creation of a multi-functional shared space facility

**KWC’s Request from ANDBC**

**Context**

SEUPB had conducted a review of the proposal and had submitted a number of queries upon which they sought clarification. SEUPB had indicated that a key challenge for the project in its assessment related to the management, governance, responsibility and undertaking of liabilities relating to the Construction phase. Accordingly, the background for this request was to deal with the challenge of construction. SEUPB in their feedback had indicated that a preferred option for a project of this scale and value would be a change of lead partner to one of the statutory partners with the natural capacity and experience to facilitate the construction of the project. This would ensure appropriate governance, management and expertise to enable a successful construction.

Ms Blayney advised the KWC had written the bid in conjunction with S3 Consulting, Belfast and it had passed the initial eligibility screening, following which two sifts on value for money had taken place. Issues that still remained a challenge were the lead partner and a preferred site. Ms Blayney informed members that a potential site at Balloo had been identified and they were currently meeting with the land owner as well as a number of key government investment agencies.

At this stage Ms Blayney advised that the request was therefore for the Council to assume the role of lead partner for the construction phase of the project. This would involve the Council:

1. Accepting and signing a Letter of Offer which on acceptance, along with the Standard Conditions of Grant and Programme Rules (together the “Grant Contract”), would constitute the legal basis for the commitment to the Project.
2. Overseeing the construction of the project with sound financial and project management. This may involve managing the cash flow of the construction. The partners had requested that SEUPB use a ‘payment in advance model’ to assist with cash flow
3. Assuming liability for capital overruns/ineligible expenditure associated with the construction process. It was difficult to predict the amount but to address this issue, we had included a 20% contingency budget.

4. Appointing a senior responsible officer for the project using council own or SIB resources (costs included in revenue budget)

5. Working with SEUPB and other project partners to find a suitable solution for the management of VAT associated with the project

6. Once construction was complete, handing over the project to an independent special purpose vehicle (community interest company) who would assume responsibility for the delivery of SEUPB targets as well as the financial and operational management of the facility and liabilities associated with same.

Ms Blayney commented that they recognised their own strengths in developing and delivering strong programmes which delivered high impact outcomes. However she also acknowledged their own weaknesses in respect of the capital development requirement for a project of this scale and complexity. Therefore KWC looked to the Council for its expertise in capital schemes which had overseen the construction of both Aurora Centre, Bangor and the Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Complex.

**Risks / Constraints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mitigation Methods</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>The original application to SEUPB included VAT as Kilcooley Women’s Centre cannot reclaim VAT. Uncertainty as to whether the Council could reclaim VAT for construction on lands that they did not own.</td>
<td>The partners had consulted SEUPB on this matter. SEUPB had in the past altered the grant request to address the VAT issue. The partners could submit a similar request</td>
<td>The partners proposed that the Council worked with them and SEUPB to resolve the VAT situation. If no suitable arrangement was found, the Council would have the option to withdraw from the role of lead partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flow</td>
<td>SEUPB policy during Peace III was to make payments in arrears, creating a cash flow requirement for lead partners</td>
<td>The partners had specified in the funding bid that a payment in advance model would be required to cash flow the project</td>
<td>Secure SEUPB agreement for payment in advance or alternatively cash flow construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Overrun</td>
<td>The lead partner was liable for any overrun during construction or ineligible spend.</td>
<td>The project budget included contingency costs at 20% within the overall proposal. Partners would appoint design team and contractors with vast experience of managing similar projects</td>
<td>As indicated earlier, additional risk management and risk reduction processes would be included to manage potential capital overruns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summing up, Ms Blayney stated that KWC wished to have a long term relationship with the Council. She informed members that the management and responsibility of the programme when operational would fall to a new oversight company and management structure. KWC was changing to reflect what it did, who it provided services for and to enable it to become more sustainable and less reliant upon grant income. Ms Blayney noted that Belfast City Council was supporting a number of projects in this round of funding and she was confident that KWC could deliver better programmes and together with the Council they could deliver a really iconic generational programme for the Borough.

The Chairman thanked Ms Blayney and Ms Harrison for their informative presentation and she invited questions from members.

Several members rose in support and with questions and the following responses were given:

- In response to a query from Alderman Irvine about potential sites and the availability of childcare spaces, Ms Blayney confirmed that their preferred site was at Balloo as it had been identified as a neutral space. The number of childcare spaces available was currently 72 and it was noted there may be more part time spaces available.
- Councillor Martin commented that he was very familiar with KWC and he took the opportunity to pay tribute to the amazing work it had carried out over the past 20 years. He acknowledged the project investment of £8M Euros and the inclusion of resource funding for three years. He asked if it was a strategic requirement to have a partner.
- Ms Blayney commented on the growing need for affordable childcare throughout the Borough and added that for significant capital projects it was preferable to have a strategic partner in place. Therefore the Council was naturally KWC’s preferred option, however she indicated that they had also had conversations with both the Northern Ireland Housing Executive and the Public Health Agency.
- Councillor McAlpine asked if KWC had a plan B.
- Ms Blayney advised that the proposed project would be a blend of both, social support with child care places. In respect of Plan B, she expressed her gratitude to Kilcooley Primary School who had assisted in providing a small office which currently housed 24 staff. She advised that 40% of their service users were from outside Kilcooley, Bangor and their services were available Borough wide.
• Alderman Smith stated that she had been providing assistance to KWC over the past 23 years and was aware they offered a lifeline to many people throughout the Borough. Continuing she acknowledged the ethos behind the centre of it being a shared space of high quality for children, young people and older people. She sought clarification on the proposed timeline for the project.
• In response Ms Blayney, confirmed that a final decision on the project would be made late November 2018, and there was a requirement for the capital build to be completed by the end of 2020. Ms Blayney added that they were fortunate to have a dedicated Board of Governors and supportive management team. It was noted that as far as they were aware there were no other bids submitted from the Borough.
• Councillor Dunne commented that the proposed ICON centre was very impressive and asked what their plans were beyond the next three years.
• Ms Blayney confirmed that she was aware PEACE V was currently being written and in preparation for that KWC would commence work on producing a bid for that. She added that while the ICON project was their vision it was also adaptable.
• Rising as Chair of PEACE IV, Councillor Thompson commended KWC on their vision and offered them his full support.

The Chairman thanked Ms Blayney and Ms Harrison for their presentation.

The deputation withdrew from the meeting at this stage – 7.56pm


PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 29 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that the report covered the 4-month period 1 April 2018 to 31 July 2018 and was set out on page 3. The net cost of services was showing an under spend of £91,646 (3.1%).

**Explanation of Variance**

A Budgetary Control Report by Income and Expenditure for the Directorate was, also, shown on page 3 which analysed the overall favourable variance (£91,646) by expenditure (£308,260 favourable) and income (£216,614 adverse). However, if the net nil distorting effect on income and expenditure of Peace IV grants was removed then the variance for expenditure was £114,860 favourable and income £23,214 adverse.

5. **COMMUNITY & WELLBEING**

**Expenditure - £308.3k (6.8%) better than budget to date.** This favourable variance was mainly made up of the following:

1. Environmental Health - £10.0k favourable. This was mainly explained by a small underspend on payroll (£8.2k).
2. Community & Culture - £207.8k favourable (£14.4k favourable after allowing for the net nil distorting effect on income and expenditure of Peace IV grants).
   a. Payroll £17.2k favourable mainly due to an underspend in Community Development (£17.8k). The vacant Manager and Coordinator posts would be filled in September.
   b. Peace 4 grant payments were £193.4k under budget to date due to a delay in the project starting (SEUPB delayed approvals) but that was offset by a similar adverse variance on income – see 4a below.

3. Leisure & Amenities - £90.1k favourable.
   a. Payroll £19.6k favourable which was mainly due to small underspends in Community Halls/Centres (£8.3k) and Leisure Admin (£12.4k – 1 vacant post).
   b. Ards LC (£28.0k), Comber LC (£6.8k), Portaferry SC (£4.1k) and Londonderry Park (£8.3k) running costs (excluding payroll) were £47.2k under budget to date. This more than offset the adverse income variance (see 5a below).
   c. Ards Half Marathon was underspent by £8.0k as the event was not held this year.
   d. There were a number of small favourable variances to date for other Leisure services such as Sports Pavilions £3.5k, Sports & Football Development £5.1k and Sports Development grants £3.2k.

Income - £216.6k (13.8%) worse than budget to date. This adverse variance was mainly made up of the following: -

4. Community and Culture - £188.6k adverse (£4.8k favourable after allowing for the net nil distorting effect on income and expenditure of Peace IV grants).
   a. Peace 4 grant income was £193.4k adverse but that was offset by a similar favourable variance on project spend – see 2b above.

5. Leisure & Amenities - £41.1k adverse.
   a. Income at Ards LC (£24.9k adverse), Comber LC (£1.4k adverse), Portaferry Sports Centre (£2.2k favourable) and Londonderry Park (£1.6k adverse) was £25.7k behind budget to date but that was more than offset by reduced running costs (see 3b above).
   b. Football Development income was £8k behind target to date.
RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Councillor Thompson, that the recommendation be adopted.

5. **UPDATE ON THE PROVISION OF AN INCLUSIVE BEACH**
   **(FILE: CW83)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 29 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that in October 2017, a notice of motion was agreed that required officers to bring back a report on the possibility of creating an inclusive beach, like that at Benone Strand in partnership with the Mae Murray
foundation, at a suitable location within our Borough, where people of all abilities could share and enjoy seaside activities.

An interim report identified Groomsport as a suitable location and Council granted approval to officers to continue to work in association with the Mae Murray Foundation on plans, estimated costs and resources required to develop and designate Groomsport Beach as an inclusive facility and to bring back a further report on the prospects of development. The following was the outworking of that task.

1. **Infrastructure Costs**

   The main infrastructure costs related to converting the existing toilet block to create a “Changing Places” toilet and shower and to create a store/maintenance area at the rear of the toilet for the storage and maintenance of beach accessibility equipment.

   a) **Toilet Block**

      - Creation of a ‘changing places’ facility by extending the current accessible toilet to incorporate a height adjustable changing table and shower.
      - Providing a hoist for use in the new changing facility.
      - Providing additional changing facilities and accessible toilets in the existing male and female toilets by altering two cubicles into one larger cubicle with a toilet, wash hand basin and changing bench in each of the male and female toilet areas.
      - Removal of the entrance step into the male and female toilets and levelling of the external ground to provide a safe access and egress.
      - Creation of a store/maintenance area at the rear of the toilet including hard standing water supply and drainage, for the storage and maintenance of beach accessibility equipment.

   b) **Beach Ramp:** some work would have to be carried out at the path leading down to the beach to create a shallow ramp to allow accessibility wheelchairs to access the sand.

   c) **Car parking:** Some wheelchair only car parking spaces would need to be created close to the toilet block. Additional disability spaces would be provided to supplement wheelchair only parking.

   The expected costs of those alterations and provisions was expected to be in the region of £40,000

2. **Equipment Costs**

   It was proposed that the Mae Murray foundation would provide equipment to operate the accessible beach to the value of £20-30,000 depending on the service provided. That would comprise around six pieces of equipment including
beach chairs, beach walkers and floating chairs to cater for differing sizes and abilities. The foundation may also provide Mobi Matting for the beach as well. However, the configuration of the access may make this unnecessary.

3. **Operating costs**

The biggest cost in relation to this project was likely to be the ongoing operating costs. Which would include staff, on-going maintenance of facilities and equipment, replacement of equipment, insurance and booking systems. The extent of these costs would be determined by the nature of the service provided and the times and hours of operation.

4. **Times and Hours of operation**

Option1

As per the original notice of motion the “like Benone strand” option.

The water quality at this location was sampled by DAERA throughout the bathing season, 1 June until 15 September every year. It was crucial the water quality was monitored at an inclusive site, as in instances of poor water quality, advice against bathing can be issued to protect public health.

**Staff**

There were staff currently near the proposed accessible beach at cockle row and the harbour. However, the skill set required to deploy specialised equipment instruct in its use and to supervise users in the water was not within the remit of existing staff. Also demand for the accessible beach was likely to be at the same times when the facilities at cockle row and the harbour would be at their busiest.

It was therefore proposed that life guards would be employed to assist users and control the operation of the accessible beach. RNLI beach lifeguard guidance indicates that a minimum of two lifeguards should be on duty at any one time. Duties would include: -

- Carrying out safety checks, a hand over, and cleaning the equipment, before and after every use.
- Deploying and retrieved matting (if required) during booking times and at any other time determined by the tide.
- Supervising the safe use of equipment and providing support in relation to water safety for all beach users.

**Equipment maintenance/replacement:** -

Due to the corrosive nature of sea water it was envisaged that equipment would require cleaning, lubrication and the replacement of parts at regular intervals.
Booking

It was proposed that the booking arrangements are handled by the Mae Murray foundation.

Insurance

It was proposed that insurance costs would be included within the existing council self-insurance arrangements. However, it was likely that the provisions of this service would raise the council’s risk profile.

The sessions for the operation of the inclusive beach would require 5 Hrs staff time per 4Hr session to allow time for set up and for checking and storing equipment. The proposed timetable for operation was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>No Of Sessions</th>
<th>Hours Per Day Service</th>
<th>Staff Hours required Per Session</th>
<th>Cost x2 lifeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Sat, Sun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4hrs</td>
<td>5hr staff</td>
<td>£1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Mon, Tues, Wed, Thurs, Fri, Sat, Sun</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4hrs</td>
<td>5hr staff</td>
<td>£4092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Mon, Tues, Wed, Thurs, Fri, Sat, Sun</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4hrs</td>
<td>5hr staff</td>
<td>£4092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Sat, Sun</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4hrs</td>
<td>5hr staff</td>
<td>£660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£10164.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those proposed times were for costing purposes only and would be confirmed after further consultation with the communities of interest. Also, it may be possible to pursue beach access at other times of the year without bathing.

Potential Cost of Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment provided by Mae Murray</th>
<th>20-30K/£0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure changes (capital cost)</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard Hut/accommodation.</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>£5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard Equipment</td>
<td>£1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Costs based on 5hrs per session ½ hr set up and ½ hr Sign off.</td>
<td>£10164.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recurring costs £20,000 per season + inflationary increases.

The funding above would provide a theoretical maximum of 518 sessions per season dividing that by the recurring cost means a minimum subsidy of £38.61 per session on revenue budgets if sessions were fully booked. The target for the first season would be 100 sessions at a subsidy of £200 per session on revenue budgets.

**Option 2**

This would be a more limited option tied to weekends during the bathing season and enhanced service during the July holiday period.

The proposed timetable for operation was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>No Of Sessions</th>
<th>Hours Per Day Service</th>
<th>Staff Hours required Per Session</th>
<th>Cost x2 lifeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Sat, Sun (10 days)</td>
<td>4hrs 5hrs</td>
<td>£1320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Sat, Sun + 2 weeks July =18 days</td>
<td>4hrs 5hrs</td>
<td>£2376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Sat, Sun 9 Days</td>
<td>4hrs 5hrs</td>
<td>£1188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Sat, Sun 5 Days</td>
<td>4hrs 5hrs</td>
<td>£660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total £5544.00

Costs for equipment maintenance and replacements would roughly be the same as option 1 therefore

Recurring costs £15,000 per season + inflationary increases.

The funding above would provide a theoretical maximum of 294 sessions per season dividing this by the recurring cost meant a minimum subsidy of £51.00 per session on revenue budgets. However, the target for the first season would be 90 sessions at a subsidy of £166 per session on revenue budgets.

**Option 3**

Would be the same as above but without equipment to access the water. This option staffing costs would be reduced by half as lifeguards would not be required; equipment maintenance would be reduced by half; equipment
replacement would be halved, and lifeguard equipment and shelter would not be required.

Recurring costs would be approximately £7,500 + inflationary increases. The funding above would provide a theoretical maximum of 294 sessions per season dividing this by the recurring cost means a minimum subsidy of £25.51 per session on revenue budgets. However, the target for the first season would be 90 sessions at a subsidy of £83.33 per session on revenue budgets.

5. Options cost summary tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option1</td>
<td>Option2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>£40000</td>
<td>£40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Guards Accom. And Equipment</td>
<td>£5000</td>
<td>£5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Provided By Mae Murray</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>£45000</td>
<td>£45000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Year1</th>
<th>Year2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option1</td>
<td>£64,664</td>
<td>£19,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option2</td>
<td>£50,544</td>
<td>£15,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option3</td>
<td>£47,000</td>
<td>£7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Further work.

It was intended that during October/November 2018 that further consultation would take place with the communities of interest about the accessible beach and with the community of Groomsport. It was hoped that the communities of interest would provide feedback on the proposed accessibility times and whether that was sufficient/too much/too little. It was hoped that the Council may get community support and buy in which might assist in making the beach accessible outside the bathing season when bathing services would not be available.

In addition, the Council would consult with the RNLI and the Coastguard in relation to liaison arrangements in event of an emergency.

RECOMMENDED that the Council note the above works and associated costs relating to the development of an accessible beach, with a view to producing an options appraisal with a recommended course of action to coincide with the estimates process.
Councillor Thompson proposed, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the recommendation be adopted.

Councillor Thompson referred to the cost options commenting that he looked forward to a further report coming back in due course.

Councillor Chambers enquired if further provision would be made for disabled parking spaces as that would impact the availability of accessible space. He also sought clarification on whether or not the proposals would have an impact on Beach Lane.

In response the Head of Environmental Health, Development and Protection advised that there would be a small reduction in the provision of standard spaces to allow for further disabled parking space provision. He added that Beach Lane was also being considered as part of the Village Plan proposals.

Councillor Chambers indicated that he had some concerns in respect of Beach Lane particularly as it could become the main access to the beach and therefore he would be keen to approach the proposals with caution.

The Head of Environmental Health, Development and Protection advised that since the report had been written, funding had become available through a Disability Sport NI Funding Stream which could assist to offset capital costs associated with the proposals.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Thompson, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the recommendation be adopted.

6. **SMOKE FREE PLAYGROUNDS AND OUTDOOR SPACES (FILE: CW86)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 28 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that smoking was the primary cause of preventable disease, disability and death in Northern Ireland. 16,700 people were admitted to hospital with 2,300 people dying annually from smoking related illness 7,000 children in Northern Ireland start smoking every year - that was 19 children each day who took up an addiction that would kill 2 in 3.

The amount of outside space children could access for play was reducing due to increasing traffic, green space development, and rules and regulations barring young people from playing in public spaces.

Playgrounds were specially designed for children, for their benefit, with the intention of getting children exercising, socialising and having fun. Children and young people had the right to play and meet their friends in a clean environment.

Making playgrounds smoke free decreased the opportunity for children to see adults smoking around them. Children were influenced by what they saw, and young
people were most at risk of becoming smokers themselves if they perceived smoking to be the norm. The most effective way to prevent young people from becoming smokers was to encourage adult smokers to quit and to reduce as far as possible young people’s exposure to smoking behaviours.

The Royal College of Physicians (2010) report on Passive Smoking and Children, recognised that all adults had a duty to prevent exposure of children to smoking behaviour and stated that ‘a policy of prohibiting smoking in publicly visible places, particularly those frequented by children, and within the vicinity of schools, nurseries and other areas where children gather in the open air, could have important public health benefits.”

The Public Health Agency and the Education Authority were currently implementing Smoke Free School Gates across the Northern Trust area. This was implemented in over 100 primary schools in the South-Eastern region in 2015. Mid and East Antrim Borough Council launched their Smoke Free Play Parks campaign in February 2018, for all 69 playgrounds in their area, currently the only NI Council to do so, although some, such as Newry, Mourne and Down District Council, had single sites.

Implementing Smoke Free Playgrounds would offer the following benefits:

- Providing clear leadership and demonstrating that ANDBC was interested in improving the health and wellbeing of the community
- Improved health and wellbeing for the local community by addressing the biggest cause of health inequalities in Northern Ireland
- Addressing social exposure to tobacco was important for eliminating the visual and sensory cues. Supporting former smokers to remain smoke free and encouraging others to quit smoking.
- De-normalising smoking behaviour, especially around young children
- Reducing cigarette litter – butts, empty packs and wrappers in the playground
- Reducing the number of repairs on safety surfaces due to stubbing out of lit cigarettes
- Reducing the risk of fire.

Having smoke free playgrounds increased access to safe community facilities to those who were unwilling to be exposed or have their children exposed to second-hand smoke. This approach provided direct and indirect support for encouraging healthy life-styles in the wider community. Clear signage and a smoke-free code could help people to challenge smoking behaviours in playgrounds.

Similar benefits could be obtained by designating synthetic pitches as smoke free as well. Currently spectators smoked around the edges of those, in plain sight of children and young people thereby “normalising” smoking, contrary to the standards which the PHA support. Further, dropping lit cigarettes on the surface of those pitches could cause damage, as well as creating a litter problem.

The designation of “smoke free sites”, as had been implemented by the Health Trusts in Northern Ireland, protected and improved the health of employees and visitors (particularly young people and children), provided a healthy environment and sent a clear message that health and wellbeing was the priority.
Currently smoking in outdoor spaces was not covered by The Smoking (Northern Ireland) Order 2006, therefore any restrictions on smoking in playgrounds, pitches, beaches or other outdoor spaces would be voluntary. This could be managed by staff approaching smokers in the same non-confrontational manner that was used to enforce the statutory provisions.

Proposal

Parks, Cemeteries and Amenities, Leisure and Environmental Health had met and agreed to recommend the following:

1. All children’s playgrounds in Ards and North Down to be made smoke-free* from December 2018.

   This would allow sufficient time for community engagement as well as press releases, social media campaigns to advise of the changes to policy, provision of suitable signage, etc in order to maximise voluntary compliance.

   Implementing Smoke-Free Playgrounds in Ards and North Down could coincide with the opening of the Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Complex in December, which had a state of the art integrated playground as a key component of the outdoor space. Launching the opening of that facility as a Smoke free play area from the outset would send a clear message that the Council was committed to protecting our children’s health and promoting a clear, safe environment in which to play.

2. All play/sport areas with synthetic coverings were similarly designated as smoke-free*.

   Not only did that continue to protect health, as discussed in relation to playgrounds, but would greatly reduce the damage to the surfaces from cigarette burns as well as reduce the levels of litter currently experienced in those areas.

3. Designate the entire outdoor site of the new Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Complex as smoke-free* from the time of opening.

   This would be the first entirely smoke free site for a Northern Ireland council but would be in line with what the Public Health Agency (PHA) aspired to and followed in the footsteps of the Health and Social Care Trusts who had made hospital sites smoke-free, prohibiting the use of both tobacco and e-cigarettes anywhere in the grounds. This would promote the new complex as a flagship for health and wellbeing, and would also ensure that the sensory garden, skateboarding parks, outdoor café areas and remainder of the site area share the same benefits as the playground.

   It was recognised that there may be some issues arising from staff, should this proposal be accepted. A communication plan would be prepared to address concerns and it would be proposed to offer smoking cessation
services to relevant staff in preparation for this move, should they wish to avail of them. This would be similar to the preparation for the Council smoking policy which prohibited the use of e-cigs and similar within council buildings (which was also a voluntary standard, not a statutory requirement.

Questions may also arise as to the enforcement of the site as smoke free, particularly as that was not a statutory requirement, but lessons had been learnt from the experiences of the hospitals and a pro-active, non-confrontational approach would be utilised alongside a high profile media campaign to raise awareness of the benefits of smoke free to encourage compliance. Any confrontation that may arise would be responded to and managed in the same way as staff would normally deal with such situations. Sessions would be held with a wide range of staff to identify and address any concerns.

Should the Council agree to the above proposals, consultation would commence with leisure staff to see what support and training they require regarding smoking cessation, handling conflict, etc. It would also be proposed to offer smoking cessation services to current Leisure Centre Members who may use this as an opportunity to quit smoking in advance of the move.

The Head of Regulatory Services had also confirmed his support for those proposals and would provide an increased presence of Enforcement Officers at the Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Complex over the winter months to monitor compliance and advise smokers of the policy. An increased frequency of visits to playgrounds and pitches would also take place by the Enforcement Team to manage smoking in those sites in addition to their routine litter/graffiti etc work. This would support the Tobacco Control Officer in detecting non-compliance and signposting to smoking cessation services.

It was hoped that by starting with those measures that the Council in due course could review their success and move towards implementing a smoke-free policy across all sites and outdoor spaces, in line with the ongoing worldwide movement to reduce tobacco-caused illness through reduced smoking and reduced exposure to second-hand smoke.

* Smoke-free would prohibit the smoking of tobacco and the use of e-cigarettes as is currently the case within the councils existing smoking policy.

RECOMMENDED that the Council designate the Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Complex as a smoke-free site, becoming the first NI Council to do so, and uses the opening to implement a Smoke-free Playgrounds policy and Smoke free synthetic pitches policy throughout the Borough, in order to protect all citizens, (and young people and children in particular), from second-hand smoke, cigarette litter, and social exposure to smoking.

Councillor Boyle proposed, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the report be deferred.
Councillor Boyle stated that while he supported the report in principal he would prefer a more detailed report which included staff consultation on the matter as he felt there could be enforcement and resource issues which would need to be addressed. Continuing he added the proposals would require the policing of over 50 playgrounds and he would be keen to know how it was proposed to carry that out. He also expressed concern that once the new leisure facility opened in Newtownards that visitors to it could potentially be greeted by gatherings of smokers on the main entrance road.

Supporting the proposal, Councillor Martin indicated that he too had been going to propose an amendment in respect of two areas, those being the use of E-Cigarettes and the designation of the entire outdoor site of the new Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Centre as smoke-free. He expressed the view that passive smoking issues needed to be considered as well as the use of E-Cigarettes.

Councillor Adair commented that the recommendation was to defer the report and discuss it at that time.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Boyle, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the report be deferred.

7. **AIR QUALITY (FILE: CW7)** (Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 29 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that attached was the 2018 Updating and Screening Assessment for air quality in Ards and North Down Borough Council area. The Council had a statutory responsibility to monitor air quality and report its findings annually to DAERA.

No monitoring sites at relevant exposure locations (adjacent to dwellings, schools, hospitals, offices, shops) within the Council Area had been shown to exceed air quality objectives set out in statute for Northern Ireland. Overall, air quality within the borough was good.

Monitoring for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) continued to require the greatest focus due to vehicle emissions at major commuter routes and changing traffic patterns brought about through redevelopment. Although levels are acceptable at monitoring locations, there was a noted increase in NO₂ measured at the A2 in Holywood during the last year. It was thought that this may have been as a result of greater vehicle movements on this route as commuters changed their journey to avoid the extensive roadworks in Belfast, in preparation for the ‘Glider’ buses. The Council would continue to observe patterns in traffic and NO₂ levels during 2018/19 to determine if that was continuing trend or a one-off event resulting from the roadworks.

RECOMMENDED that that the Council approves the Updating and Screening Assessment for air quality in Ards and North Down Borough Council for 2018 for submission to DAERA.

Councillor Adair proposed, seconded by Councillor Muir, that the recommendation be adopted.
Expressing his thanks to officers, Councillor Muir commented that the report had been very useful and raised a number of issues for further consideration particularly in respect of the A2 in Holywood. He acknowledged there was a new housing development planned in Holywood and asked if officers had any concerns in relation to that.

The Head of Environmental Health, Development and Protection confirmed that monitoring would continue at that particular location in Holywood. He acknowledged that while traffic had undoubtedly increased there, pollution had not to the same degree due to improvements in vehicle emission standards and added that he was confident objectives should not be exceeded.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Councillor Muir, that the recommendation be adopted.

8. UPDATE ON AFFORDABLE WARMTH SCHEME FUNDING 2018-2019 (FILE: CW8)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 24 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that the Department for Communities (DfC) had set a referral rate of 220 households per council for 2018/19, which meant only 17 referrals a month for our area from July 2018.

Since then, the DfC had increased the target to 337 referrals per council area, which meant that 30 referrals a month would now be permitted in the area from July 2018. The funding provided, however, would remain at £68,780.

This increase in referral rate would help alleviate pressures on waiting lists, however there were still approximately 40 completed applications to be sent to NIHE, and over 220 households on the “expression of interest” list, for example households who felt they met the qualifying criteria for the scheme and therefore wished to be considered.

The Affordable Warmth Scheme therefore remained challenging to manage but members could be assured that officers were continually raising their concerns at meetings with DfC and continue to try to support those most in need within the budgetary constraints.

Despite those changes occurring quite quickly after the last Community & Wellbeing Committee, the Head of Service had, as requested, written to DfC to express member’s concern over the continuing reduction in financial allocation since the inception of the programme. The letter asked that due consideration was given to supporting the Affordable Warmth scheme at a higher rate, guaranteed over a longer period of time, rather than continue with the uncertainty and significant reductions in budget that have occurred to date.

RECOMMENDED that that Council notes this report.
Councillor Chambers proposed, seconded by Councillor Thompson, that the recommendation be adopted.

Councillor Adair proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that the Council notes the report and writes to the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) and Department for Communities expressing concern at the delay in payments being processed for the Affordable Warmth Scheme.

Commending officers for the report, Councillor Adair stated that fuel poverty was an issue throughout the entire Borough and he acknowledged that officers had been very pro-active to date processing applications. However delays of up to 12 weeks had been experienced with applications being held up by the NIHE. Therefore he asked that the Council writes to both the NIHE and the Department asking them to address the matter.

Supporting the amendment, Councillor Boyle indicated that he slightly disagreed with some of the comments raised by Councillor Adair. He stated that the NIHE in his experience had always been more than helpful and no one had been left without heating.

At this stage Councillor Adair stated he was referencing the experience of private tenants/home owners and grant payments to them rather than NIHE tenants.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that the Council notes the report and writes to the Northern Ireland Housing Executive and Department for Communities expressing concern at the delay in payments being processed for the Affordable Warmth Scheme.

9. **PUBLIC DRINKING WATER SUPPLY (FILE:CW98)** (Appendix IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 23 July 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that attached was the Drinking Water Quality Report produced by Northern Ireland Water for the Ards and North Down Borough Council area. The report indicated a 99.9% compliance with an extensive array of drinking water quality parameters as laid down in the Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2007.

 Particularly interesting to note, was compliance rates in relation to Trihalomethanes, which demonstrated the effectiveness of improvements to the water treatment infrastructure over the last 10-15 years. Also, there were no failures in relation to lead, which was probably linked to the inclusion of orthophosphoric acid in treated water (this chemical reduces lead solvency) and the reduction in lead pipework and lead solder in domestic properties.

**RECOMMENDED** that that the report be noted.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the recommendation be adopted.
10. **CONSULTATION ON THE FOOD LAW CODE OF PRACTICE (NORTHERN IRELAND) (FILE: CW39)**

( Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 24 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that the Food Standards Agency (FSA) was currently seeking comments on the proposed revision of the statutory Food Law Code of Practice (Northern Ireland). The Code set out the criteria that local authorities need to follow when planning and carrying out their food law regulatory responsibilities.

The main changes related to procedures for food business registration and the risk assessment tool used to determine the minimum inspection frequency for individual food establishments.

The Northern Ireland Food Managers Group (NIFMG), which had representation from all 11 Councils, had considered the proposals and had formed some initial views which had been incorporated into the attached response.

The full consultation document could be accessed at: -

RECOMMENDED that Council approve the response to the Food Standards Agency’s Consultation on the Food Law Code of Practice (Northern Ireland).

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Martin, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the recommendation be adopted.**

11. **PCSP MINUTES DATED 25 JUNE 2018**

( Appendix VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Minutes of meeting of PCSP held on 25 June 2018.

RECOMMENDED that the minutes be noted.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Martin, that the recommendation be adopted.**

12. **PEACE IV MINUTES DATED 24 MAY 2018** (Appendix VII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Minutes of meeting of Peace IV held on 24 May 2018.

RECOMMENDED that the minutes be noted.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Thompson, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the recommendation be adopted.**
13. **GOOD RELATIONS ANNUAL REPORT (FILE: GREL 252)**  
(Appendix VIII)


The Good Relations section was externally funded 75% from the Executive Office and 25% by Council. The total Good Relations budget for 2017/2018 was £227,800.

A Good Relations Strategy (2015-2018) was agreed by Council in 2015. The Strategy informed an annual action plan, which was submitted to the Executive Office for assessment. The Action Plan was based on the four key themes of the Executives Strategy Together Building United Communities:

- Children and Young People
- Shared community
- Safe Community
- Cultural Expression

Good Relations work closely with the Councils PCSP, PEACE IV and Community Development sections to avoid duplication and ensure a cohesive delivery of programmes to the community.

RECOMMENDED that that Council notes this report.

Alderman Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor Martin, that the recommendation be adopted.

In response to a query from Councillor McAlpine about the extensive Level 2 Programme, the Externally Funded Programme Manager indicated that she would report back to the member in due course on the matter.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Councillor Martin, that the recommendation be adopted.

14. **APPROVAL FOR THE ARTS OFFICER & ARTS AND HERITAGE MANAGER ATTENDANCE AT TYRONE GUTHRIE CENTRE (FILE: ART02)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 29 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that the Arts and Heritage Manager and Arts Officer (Chair) were both members of the Arts Manager’s Group NI and were organising a residential for the AGM for the group at the Tyrone Guthrie Centre in Annaghmakerrig, County Monaghan at the invite of the Director.
The Director of the Tyrone Guthrie Centre had offered to host the AGM to encourage networking and cross border collaboration with members of the Association of Local Authority Arts Officer’s in the Republic of Ireland.

The budget required for this visit would be one nights’ accommodation at the Tyrone Guthrie Centre for two officers at a total cost of €100 plus mileage. Subsistence would be provided by the Tyrone Guthrie Centre. Subject to approval Officer’s would attend from 3-4 December 2018.

RECOMMENDED that that Council approves the Arts and Heritage Manager and Arts Officer to attend the residential Arts Manager’s AGM at the Tyrone Guthrie Centre with all associated costs covered by the Arts Development budget.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the recommendation be adopted.

(Councillors Adair, Dunne and Thompson all declared an interest in the next item and left the meeting at this stage – 8.15pm)

15. **RURAL PARTNERS BASIC SERVICES PROGRAMME – REQUESTS FOR 5% MATCH FUNDING – KILCOOLEY WOMENS CENTRE (FILE: CW71)** (Appendix IX)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report dated 31 August 2018 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing stating that Ards and North Down Rural Partnership, Rural Development Basic Services Scheme recently opened for full applications from applicants who had submitted an Expression of Interest form earlier this year. This funding would potentially support technical and capital investments which would provide access to basic services or improvements in social infrastructure which were an integral part of the Council Community Plan and its emerging priorities.

The Partnership would offer successful applicants a grant of up to 75% (max £5,000 towards technical applications and max of £200,000 towards capital applications) towards their project. Council had agreed to support 5% of the remainder, with groups expected to contribute the final 20% by other means, with at least 5% coming directly from the applicant group.

The value of the Basic Services scheme was £897,750, which meant that once the all the funding had been allocated, community projects to the value of £1,196,666.60 of eligible project costs would have been implemented in the Borough.

Council had agreed to contribute a maximum of £59,833.33 across all successful projects. Interested groups who submitted an Expression of Interest form would be advised by the Partnership if their project was eligible in principle or not to progress to the formal application stage. Those applicants whose projects had been deemed eligible in principle had been advised of the need to contact relevant Council Officers in order to seek confirmation of the Councils 5% financial contribution.
Council must decide on whether it supported the applicant’s proposed project and provide a letter of support for its 5% contribution, on a project by project basis. The final decision on whether or not to award the Basic Services grant rested with the Ards and North Down Rural Partnership, and the 5% letter of match funding support from the Council was one of the essential criteria for any award.

This report related to an expression of interest from Kilcooley Women’s Centre (KWC) which had provided services to women, children and families since 1995. Services included extensive training, childcare, employability skills, work placements, volunteering schemes, peace building and good relations and social economy initiatives.

Whilst based in Kilcooley Estate Bangor, the centre attracted participants from across the Borough and transcended the urban, rural and community divides. KWC had advised that they had been unable to meet the identified need in rural parts of the peninsula, where there was heightened disadvantage for women, poor infrastructure to support the advancement of women, children and their families and reduced engagement in regional activity for women to enable full participation in post conflict Northern Ireland and the provision of a voice for rural women.

KWC had applied to the RDP to undertake a feasibility study to extend the urban Women’s Centre services across the Borough and in particular the peninsula, including the evidence of need to assist KWC in the development of facilities to provide access to services.

The applicant had discussed the proposal with the Head of Community and Culture. It was anticipated that the level of investment required from Council would be 5% of the total project cost £6,250; £312.50 towards the proposed feasibility study, appendix 1. Note: those were indicative figures as the final procurement exercise had not yet been undertaken.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves a contribution of 5% of the proposed feasibility study (to allow for change following procurement) on the condition that the project is deemed eligible and is successfully awarded grant aid by Ards and North Down Rural Partnership.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the recommendation be adopted.

(Councillors Adair, Dunne and Thompson returned to the meeting at this stage – 8.16pm)

16. **NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

16.5. **Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman Smith and Councillor Chambers**

Alderman Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the Council own the allotments situated at Bryansburn Road. These have been allowed to become a little more than a wilderness. There are approximately 20 good sized allotments with only 5 being used with I understand a waiting list.
This Notice of Motion is seeking a full report as to why the allotments have been allowed to become little more than a wasteland and importantly as well what is their future.

Alderman Smith reported that she had been approached by those who used the allotments on the Bryansburn Road asking what and when the Council was going to do something about the terrible state the allotment area was in. She noted that some time ago Councillor Muir had put forward a Notice of Motion proposing that there should be a growth of allotment provision within the Borough, which was supported by members. Continuing she indicated that she was in total support of this and after talking to a number of people about this they were more than supportive that more allotments were needed in the Borough. However, she stated that her request was about the allotments which the Council already owned at the Bryansburn Road.

Continuing, Alderman Smith expressed the view that the allotments on the Bryansburn Road had been forgotten about by Council. The weeds were some six feet high, the plots were overgrown, there were noxious weeds, pathways had become lost in the undergrowth making it very difficult to walk about the place, the gates were falling apart and rubbish had been left to pile up, a very sorry sight. She noted there were five dedicated people who tended their plots amidst what she could only call devastation. She commended them to the highest degree, as they tended their plots, kept them tidy and what they produced was little short of a miracle and that was not an exaggeration. She was aware the allotment holders had over a number of years sought help from the Council, however the general feeling was that the allotments had been given up or lost within the Council system. There were some 20 allotments contained within the site, with only five currently in use and Alderman Smith understood there was a waiting list of over 130. She queried why that had been allowed to happen.

In order to find out how progress could be made on restoring the allotments, Alderman Smith advised that she had held discussions with the officer concerned along with several of the allotment holders and had also visited the site a number of times. Some of the issues which needed to be resolved to bring the allotments up to an acceptable standard were as detailed below:

- There was a need to scrape or strim the site and then apply suitable weed killer on a repeated basis to unused plots
- Realignment of plots and the provision of paths to clearly demarcate allotments
- The opportunity to reduce the size of abandoned allotment plots creating a greater number of plots which could then be reallocated and help reduce the long waiting list
- The facility for the removal of refuse from the site, for example a skip which could be placed or several large size bins on site which could be emptied when notified or simply on a regular basis by Council
- The provision of an entrance which would give easy access to the site and enable site holders to bring without difficulty, manure and compost.
- The broken down gates need repaired
• Water access which was more than necessary
• Toilets – again something very necessary
• Tenants agreements and rents should be restored, that again seems to have become lost in the system
• Some form of checking or monitoring should be established to stop allotments from falling into neglect as before.
• There was a need to establish and enforce a right of way for tenants using the Bryansburn Road entrance

Continuing, Alderman Smith stated that the existing allotment holders had been informed that they could if they wished to retain the size of their allotments. She added that her understanding on this was that yes some would wish to retain their plots as they were. Negotiations could then take place when allocation on any future allocation of allotments came forward. In her opinion, Alderman Smith commented that the allotments on the Bryansburn Road had been forgotten about and therefore her Motion was seeking a full report on why that had happened, what their future was, and that any work following the proposed report to be carried out would take place as soon as possible by Council to bring the site back to being usable. As well as that through the waiting list the allotments were reallocated to ensure it was once again a fully working area bringing in revenue. She advised that following her discussions with the Officer concerned she felt that action could be taken and following this Notice of Motion the work needed would not be costly. However, she added that she wished to make sure that any decision on their future would be positive and would happen quickly. Furthermore she would be keen for the follow up report to be brought back as soon as possible and any work to reinstate the allotments to happen as soon as possible.

By way of summing up, Alderman Smith thanked the officer for the time he had given her and the allotment holders, listening to the problems regarding the site. This was not an unacceptable request neither was it a request which would have a great deal of finance to implement and importantly it would produce an income. She added that she merely wished to see what should have happened, happen now. She reiterated that her Notice of Motion sought a full report as to why the allotments had been allowed to become little more than a wasteland and more importantly establish what their future was. She added that she hoped decisions were taken quickly and positively for the allotments and their holders.

(Councillor Douglas entered the meeting at this stage – 8.18pm)

Rising as seconder, Councillor Chambers expressed his support for the Motion adding that he had been unaware that the allotments had fallen into such a bad state of repair prior to this being brought to his attention.

Councillor Martin agreed that if the space was available at Bryansburn Road for the allotments and the demand was there for them he would look forward to a report coming back in due course, adding that an income opportunity should be welcomed

Also rising in support of the Motion, Councillor Muir thanked the member for bringing it forward.
In summing up, Alderman Smith stated that she looked forward to seeing activity resume on the site the Bryansburn Road.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Councillor Chambers, that the Council own the allotments situated at Bryansburn Road. These have been allowed to become a little more than a wilderness. There are approximately 20 good sized allotments with only 5 being used with I understand a waiting list.

16.1 Notice of Motion Submitted by Alderman Irvine

Alderman Irvine proposed, seconded by Councillor Adair, that this Council liaises with the Woodland Trust on a project to plant new trees within Castle Park Bangor to commemorate the centenary of the ending of the First World War.

Alderman Irvine commented that given the significance of the VC recipient Edward Bingham and his close association with Bangor Castle and the neighbouring Helen’s Tower and Clandeboye Wood which were used by soldiers in the First World War as a training ground, it was appropriate to mark this centenary year.

He suggested that the Council liaised with the Woodland Trust whom he had already raised the matter with and had responded as follows:

“What a brilliant idea and especially relevant in North Down bearing in mind the role that the Clandeboye Estate played in preparing soldiers from the 36th (Ulster) Division before they set off to war.

The Woodland Trust's Project with HRH The Princess Royal as Patron sought to plant millions of trees across the United Kingdom creating not only living memorials to remind us and our grandchildren of the sacrifice made on our behalf but also growing into beautiful places for relaxation, reflection and enjoyment.

Here in Northern Ireland at Brackfield Wood, on the outskirts of Londonderry, 40,000 native trees would be planted, one each for every Irish life lost during the war.

In parallel with this project a number of landowners are planting groves along the lines you propose. The Trust would be delighted in helping you achieve your vision of planting 100 trees marking the centenary of the FWW. Might be that a corner of Castle Park could be set aside for the planting of such trees with members of the public invited on the day to plant a tree in memory of an ancestor.

I am happy to explore such a site with you and officers of the Council. The Trust would also be prepared to make available 100 saplings for the site. We could also explore with your officials how the grove would be branded as an element of our First World War Centenary Woods Project which would serve as a reminder to visitors the purpose of the grove and the sacrifice made by so many on our behalf.

The Trust will supply the trees free of charge which would leave Council to fund the branding.
Be assured that the Trust will help in any way possible”

Alderman Irvine encouraged members to support his motion.

Councillor Adair rose in support of the motion adding that it was a very fitting proposal during this centenary year.

Councillor Martin also rose in support of his colleagues adding that it was very appropriate for this centenary year and particularly as the proposals were environmentally friendly and trees would be provided free of charge.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Adair, that this Council liaises with the Woodland Trust on a project to plant new trees within Castle Park Bangor to commemorate the centenary of the ending of the First World War.**

16.2. Notice of Motion Submitted by Councillor Gilmour, Councillor Armstrong-Cotter and Councillor Cathcart

This Council commends the wonderful work carried out by Midwives and calls upon the officers to bring back a report detailing how we can commemorate the centenary of the Midwives (Ireland) Act 1918, which turned Midwifery into a regulatory profession, possibly through a Commemorative Flower bed, and a historical display in North Down Museum.

Councillor Gilmour proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Adair, that this Council commends the wonderful work of midwives. In recognition of the centenary of the Midwives (Ireland) Act 1918 which turned Midwifery into a regulatory profession we write to the Chief Executive of the South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust and also the Director of the Royal College of Midwives to mark the occasion and express our thanks and appreciation for the ongoing work of Midwives within our Borough.

Councillor Gilmour noted that midwifery was one of the oldest professions in the world, with records on Papyrus from ancient Egypt which detailed the profession. She stated that midwives had played an important role in everyone’s lives and those of their families and although it was an age-old profession, the first Midwives Act in Ireland, was established in 1918. Midwifery became legally recognised in Britain in 1902, followed by a series of United Kingdom (UK) Midwives Acts in 1926 and 1936. Those provided legislation to ensure that only qualified midwives could attend births, however many women continued to seek unqualified midwives as they costed less. Those Acts were the birth of a regulated profession and establishment of standards for education and training. Continuing she acknowledged that midwifery was a profession providing care for women in pregnancy and childbirth and had played a significant role throughout history. It was generally recognised that the midwife had been with us since biblical times and that midwifery was the oldest female occupation and without doubt one of the most important.
2018 marked 100 years since the Midwives (Ireland) Act and it was therefore fitting that the Council acknowledged how midwifery practice had developed and improved. There were many midwives who lived or worked throughout the Borough who did a very difficult job and they got to share some of the happiest moments in life, helping to bring a new life into the world, however they also had to deal with some of the very worst moments where a pregnancy had not progressed as expected or there had been other complications where someone had lost their child. Those could be very difficult and emotional situations which they had to deal with and therefore she was standing tonight to thank each and every one of them over the years for the hard work and dedication they put into their job. They also provided an important educational role on a number of issues such as health, nutrition, parentcraft classes and particular programmes for younger mothers.

Councillor Gilmour commented that she had only became aware of this significant centenary at the beginning of the summer whilst reading an article in the newspaper and she was keen to ensure that the Council marked the occasion by recognising the midwifery profession and also showing its appreciation to midwives. She referred to her amended motion stating that she appreciated the things mentioned in her original motion would not be possible given how late it was now in this centenary year. Instead she asked that the Council wrote to the Chief Executive of the SEHSCT and also Director of RCM to recognise the important and vital role midwives played within the community.

Whilst the Council had recently bestowed the freedom of the Borough on all Health and Social Care Staff and celebrated the 70th anniversary of the NHS and recognised the work of all of the staff, she felt it was only right that the Council specifically acknowledged this milestone for the profession of midwifery in the Borough.

At this stage Councillor Gilmour referred to the popular tv series “Call the Midwife”, acknowledging that many people had been fascinated by the show as it highlighted how incredible midwives were and how they had adapted over the years and some of the challenging situations which they had dealt with in years gone by. The RCM were actually compiling a book to mark the centenary this year where they hoped to get 100 accounts, experiences and photographs from midwives throughout Ireland, and particularly Northern Ireland. She added that it would be nice if the Council could get an exhibition in North Down Museum sometime in future years but she appreciated those things took time to arrange.

Continuing, Councillor Gilmour stated that like surgeons of an earlier age, prior to the Act, those practising midwifery were untrained, unqualified and uncertified. Any woman, or for that matter, any man could practise midwifery, and she was sure there were varying levels of skill ability, practices and also levels of charges. For example it had been reported that some practitioners were prostitutes who were reputedly paid in gin. Following the Act, a woman could not call herself, nor practise as a midwife, unless she was certified under the Act. After that date, no woman (Parliament assumed men, unless doctors, would not be involved) could habitually or for financial reward attend a woman in childbirth unless certified.

Many years of training were undertaken by midwives now, not only to qualify but to maintain their training to the highest standard. They were proud of their profession,
and referred to a friend who was recently was talking to someone and had said ‘oh you’re a nurse aren’t you?’ to which they had got a firm reply ‘no I’m a midwife’ It was its own special profession and to many was a vocation. From personal experience she wished to say that all of the study and qualifications really showed in the level of service and support which they provided to expectant mothers who were not always easily dealt with or indeed the most rational individuals, particularly during the latter stages of active labour.

Councillor Gilmour commented that unfortunately Councillor Armstrong Cotter could not be present at the meeting due to illness but she was aware this was something she felt very passionately about and was sure she would have spoken eloquently on the matter drawing on her own personal experiences and also her family members who were midwives.

In summing up Councillor Gilmour thanked members for hearing her motion and sought their support on this matter.

Rising to second the proposal, Councillor Adair sent his best wishes to Councillor Armstrong-Cotter for a speedy recovery. Continuing he expressed his gratitude to all midwives who served throughout Northern Ireland and agreed that it was entirely appropriate that they were recognised in this manner.

Councillor Douglas also expressed her support for the motion commenting on the importance of acknowledging the work of those in the Health Service.

Alderman Smith similarly expressed her support for Motion and thanked Councillor Gilmour for her informative speech, particularly on the history of midwifery.

At this stage Councillor Martin paid tribute to his colleague for bringing it forward for consideration. He acknowledged the dedication of midwives and how proud they were of their profession. Continuing he stated that all involved in the midwifery profession were exceptional and carried out an amazing job.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Councillor Gilmour, seconded by Councillor Adair, that this Council commends the wonderful work of midwives. In recognition of the centenary of the Midwives (Ireland) Act 1918 which turned Midwifery into a regulatory profession we write to the Chief Executive of the South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust and also the Director of the Royal College of Midwives to mark the occasion and express our thanks and appreciation for the ongoing work of Midwives within our Borough.

### 16.3. Notice of Motion Submitted by Councillor Dunne

Councillor Dunne proposed, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that this Council considers the need for investment at the Seapark Tennis Courts in Holywood and tasks Officers to bring back a report to outline possible steps to improve these facilities and ensure they are in a useable standard.

Councillor Dunne noted that Seapark Tennis Courts and the adjacent Pavilion were located in a wonderful, scenic location which attracted many visitors. However
currently the Tennis Courts were in serious need of investment having the same painted tarmac surface for some 20 years. The surface had become dangerous with a number of major cracks, which had resulted in two courts being deemed unsafe to use.

Continuing, he commented on the considerable investment in local sports facilities across the Borough, which he welcomed, however to date he noted there had been a lack of investment within facilities such as those. He added that he understood other facilities were charging the same rate for tennis, on surfaces which were far superior to what was on offer at Seapark. He was also aware there had been discussions for some time, regarding the redevelopment of those facilities with the Kerr Park Scheme. Therefore in any report that would hopefully come forward from his Notice of Motion, could bring members up to speed on that Scheme.

Councillor Dunne expressed the view that his Notice of Motion provided the opportunity for officers to see what could be done to improve those facilities. He acknowledged there had been coaching sessions taking place during the summer months on the Tennis Courts, however given the condition of the courts, the programme had been restricted. He expressed the view that there was great potential to develop the area, with newly surfaced tennis courts and a new pavilion, particularly as the area benefited from many visitors from across the Borough and beyond every day. Therefore he hoped this could be a step forward in seeing the area improved upon going forward and he hoped members would support him.

Alderman Irvine commended his colleague for bringing forward the Notice of Motion adding that it was important that this sports facility did not continue to fall into disrepair. Instead he stated that the Council should be encouraging people to participate in sport through the use of Council facilities which were up to the appropriate standard.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Dunne, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that this Council considers the need for investment at the Seapark Tennis Courts in Holywood and tasks Officers to bring back a report to outline possible steps to improve these facilities and ensure they are in a useable standard.

16.4. Notice of Motion Submitted by Councillor McIlveen

That this Council erects appropriate signage at Movilla cemetery, in consultation with the family of Blair Mayne, to indicate the location of the final resting place of Lieutenant-Colonel Blair Mayne.

Councillor Adair proposed, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that the Notice of Motion be deferred to the October meeting of the Community and Wellbeing Committee.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that the Notice of Motion be deferred to the October meeting of the Community and Wellbeing Committee.
16.6. Notice of Motion submitted by Alderman Smith and Alderman Irvine

Alderman Smith proposed, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the railings at the roundabout at the top of Main Street at the post office in Bangor, were once a colourful welcome of beautiful rail hanging baskets. Now it is simply a blank dreary and barren area. There is a considerable difference in the number of rail planters between Newtownards town centre approach, roughly over 90 rail planters to that of Bangor which is nil. Following many complaints regarding this situation, I would ask for a full report as to why this is happening and how the approach into Bangor can be restored to something which was once something to be proud of.

Alderman Smith commented that she had brought her Notice of Motion forward as she had received so many complaints about the lack of beautiful colourful floral displays on the approach to Bangor. Current planting at the top of Main Street had been described as dull as was that down the central areas in Abbey Street. The railings at the roundabout at the top of Main Street in Bangor were once a colourful welcome display of beautiful rail hanging baskets and now it was noted there was no planting in place.

Continuing, Alderman Smith referred to the difference in the number of rail planters between Newtownards town centre approach, where there were roughly over 90 rail planters, to that of Bangor at the Post Office where currently there was nothing. At this stage she indicated she was not making the matter into a competition of which town had the most planters but merely highlighting the very visible difference. Not wishing to labour the point, she reported that she had been informed that in Bangor the total was 183 which covered planters, hanging baskets, plus the permanent planters while in Ards there were 267 again covering planters, hanging baskets and permanent planters. So, Alderman Smith suggested that it appeared that Bangor had considerably less planting and that had become very noticeable to her when being driven to Ards when she had counted roughly 90 planters attached to the railings plus quite a number heading out of Ards. She added that she had noticed how beautiful the display was when entering the town.

Again at this stage Alderman Smith stressed it was not a competition between the two towns. Indeed she had noted that Comber was like a picture post card and driving past Holywood on the Main A2 there were beautiful display of baskets on the railings. Continuing she commented that if she was asked if she was proud of the Abbey Street and roundabout at the Post Office for their “floral displays” there, her response would be no. She referred particularly to the roundabout commenting that she did not know what had happened there, as it now appeared to be occupied by fast growing, dull grasses. Alderman Smith reported that she had tried to look at the roundabout to see what was being newly installed there and had found it difficult to work out and was something which needed to be viewed standing near-by. Continuing she advised that it had taken a while to work it out as there were a couple of lobster pots and something with green plants around it which she had been advised was to represent a star fish. Not two things she would immediately think of when she thought of Bangor, particularly when what was previously displayed there, the lovely little replica sailing boat which now sat so prettily on the roundabout at the entrance of Groomsport. Alderman Smith expressed the view that surely a sailing
boat reflected Bangor’s marina which was full of boats and stated that while she was not asking that the boat was removed from Groomsport, as it looked fantastic particularly surrounded by the colourful planting, but instead that a small sailing boat could be made and placed on the roundabout in Main Street, Bangor.

Turning to the long grass at Main Street roundabout, Alderman Smith proceeded to provide an example of not only that it was dull but dangerous. She had been driving down Abbey Street, on the inside lane, stopped at the roundabout, looked left- at which point her vision had been restricted because of how tall the grass had grown and had not seen a car going around the roundabout travelling from Main Street on the inside lane next to the grass to turn right until it had travelled enough indicating to turn right. She reported on how taken aback at how far round the car had been before it came into her line of vision. She added that there had been no doubt in her mind that an accident could happen there and suggested that particular section of grass needed to cut down or taken out and suggested action was taken immediately.

At this stage Alderman Smith reported that she had been informed that as part of the Public Realm Scheme project the railings installed at Main Street were of a chrome finish construction and were a different size to the previous fabrications. As a result, the planters normally used could not be because of the chrome finish and fixing brackets which now did not fit. She commented that if that was the case and it was a mistake then surely it was something which could be fixed.

Continuing, Alderman Smith stated that during debates she had had with officers she hoped that an answer may be found quickly so that some sort of replanting at the roundabout could once more take place and that somehow an answer in respect of the colourful planting on the railings could take place. Similarly she hoped Abbey Street planting would change which in her opinion would only be for the better. Indeed she had noted many towns when driving through which had grassy banks with floral displays and stated that Bangor had the perfect answer along Abbey Street where planting would be welcomed. As for the central planting down Abbey Street and the roundabout, she believed that had been carried out through the Public Realm Scheme and that the Council had no say in what had been planted. At this stage Alderman Smith acknowledged the first class team who had always achieved success in planting and gone a long way in winning prizes and suggested therefore the Council had the expertise to return to how planting used to be done and get back to attractive, colourful displays.

By way of summing up, Alderman Smith expressed her hope that the report detailing the various items of planting would come back to Council as soon as possible. Furthermore, that the planting left via the Public Realm Scheme was removed as soon as possible and that Bangor returned to an entrance which was welcoming and attractive in the planting which the Council so often excelled in.

Concurring with the proposer’s comments, Alderman Irvine rose to second the motion adding that he too had received many negative comments about the lack of planting in Bangor. He agreed that it should not be seen as a competition between Bangor and Newtownards and instead the difference appeared to have resulted following the completion of the Public Realm works. He added that he looked forward
to the report coming back in due course particularly in respect of the sightlines at the roundabout referred to.

Thanking Alderman Smith, Councillor Dunne echoed the comments which had already been made and agreed there were urgent safety concerns which needed to be addressed at the roundabout in respect of sight lines. He added that he hoped the planting referred to could be restored in due course and also looked forward to the report coming back for consideration.

Councillor Douglas stated that she had mixed comments to make on the matter, particularly as she liked the variety of planting currently on display throughout the Borough, which in her opinion gave a little bit of individuality to each town and village. She added that she particularly liked the wild flower display on the roundabout at the Six Road Ends, Bangor and the display on the roundabout at the Post Office in Bangor, which she noted was the award winning display from an earlier garden show held in Antrim. Continuing she added that she liked the length of grasses currently on display and noted how they were currently blooming and commended the team for their efforts.

By way of summing up Alderman Smith commented that she was not a fan of grasses and felt it was reflective with planting arrangements more commonly seen back in the sixties. Instead she wished to see the wonderful floral planting displays reinstated as soon as possible.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the railings at the roundabout at the top of Main Street at the post office in Bangor, were once a colourful welcome of beautiful rail hanging baskets. Now it is simply a blank dreary and barren area. There is a considerable difference in the number of rail planters between Newtownards town centre approach, roughly over 90 rail planters to that of Bangor which is nil. Following many complaints regarding this situation, I would ask for a full report as to why this is happening and how the approach into Bangor can be restored to something which was once something to be proud of.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Councillor Adair sought permission to bring forward items of Any Other Notified Business at this stage.

The Chairman sought the agreement of members, and as all were not in agreement, a vote by a show of hands was taken.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, with 7 voting For, 4 voting Against and 2 Abstaining, that items of Any Other Notified Business be discussed at this stage before going Into Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 9.00pm for a comfort break.
The meeting reconvened at 9.10pm.

ANY OTHER NOTIFIED BUSINESS

1. **Update on Play Strategy – Councillor Adair**

Councillor Adair noted that the Council was to develop a Play Strategy from 2015 and was keen to know when upgrade works would be carried out to the play area at Rubane. Continuing he also referred to a Notice of Motion which had been brought to Council almost three years ago about MUGAs and was aware that many suitable funding opportunities were now no longer available. Therefore in light of that he sought an update on the Strategy.

In response, the Director of Community and Wellbeing confirmed that the two legacy Play Strategies were currently in place and combined proposals agreed by both legacy Councils. Indeed, he reported that a new park was due to be provided in Scrabo Estate, Newtownards and at a site in Ballycrochan, Bangor arising out of those. He added that resources needed to be in place to enable similar work to be carried out to review the strategies and it was noted work to put this in place had commenced.

Councillor Adair expressed the view that the current Play Strategy was outdated.

**NOTED.**

2. **Update on Portavogie 3G – Councillor Adair**

Councillor Adair recalled that the provision the of 3G Pitches had been agreed during the rate setting process for the villages of Portavogie and Portaferry and to date there had been no progress on the delivery of either.

In response the Director of Community and Wellbeing reported that significant progress had taken place behind the scenes. Tender submissions had closed at the end of August 2018 for the Portavogie scheme and a report on those would be brought to the September Council meeting for consideration. In respect of the Portaferry scheme he reported that discussions remained ongoing in respect of a preferred location. He added however that it was unlikely either scheme would be in place before the end of the Council term.

**NOTED.**

3. **Peninsula Summer Schemes – Councillor Adair**

Councillor Adair suggested that in future Summer Schemes were spread out throughout the Ards Peninsula with one being held for one week in Portaferry, one week in Portavogie and a further week in another Peninsula village. He asked that officers considered that approach in subsequent years.
The Chairman thanked the member for his suggestion.

**NOTED.**

**4. Unplayable Condition of Grass Pitches in Kircubbin and Portavogie – Councillor Adair**

Councillor Adair noted that there was only one pitch which was now playable and current arrangements in place were now not working and suggested that consultation was undertaken with the Clubs and their users. He reported that a recent match to be played at Kircubbin had been called off by the referee and he encouraged officers to ensure that all pitches were playable. Councillor Adair added that all Club home matches should be able to be played on their home grounds.

In response the Head of Leisure and Amenities advised that the pitch should only be used for matches and not training. A training surface was provided on the site. The Council had contacted the Portavogie Club in January 2018 and asked them to desist training on the pitch given the significant amount of damage which was being caused by their overuse. He added that the Club had again been contacted in March 2018 with a similar request. The pitch was then closed as normal for the summer after the local primary school with due permission obtained had used part of it for its annual sports day to allow the Councils contractor to carry out maintenance works and rest the ground for the new season. However it was discovered that during the Summer when the pitch had been closed the Club had used the pitch for unauthorised tournaments, adding again more wear to the surface. Continuing the Head of Leisure and Amenities informed members that when the new season commenced the Club had chosen not to use the pitch in order to try to assist the Council in recovering the surface quality and indeed he noted that no bookings had been taken from the Club for any home fixtures. He confirmed that no bookings had yet been made by the Club for use on the up and coming Saturday.

Councillor Adair suggested that it may be useful for Council officers to meet face to face with representatives of the Club and that was something he would be happy to facilitate.

The Head of Leisure and Amenities indicated that the Council had a good relationship with the Club and contact remained ongoing.

At this stage Councillor Boyle commented that in respect of the pitches at Kircubbin, officers there had acted very promptly and while he was aware a match had been called off by the referee, the pitch had been cut in preparation for the game. He added that it had been the referee who had taken the decision that the pitch was not playable.

**NOTED.**
5. **Cairn Wood/Ballysallagh Forest Upper and Adjoining Reservoir Plans – Councillor Muir**

Councillor Muir noted the information which had been circulated to members in respect of this and sought clarification on whether or not there would be any potential impact on the Council plans for Cairn Wood.

The Director of Community and Wellbeing referred to the report on the Development Opportunity which detailed three phases, those being:

- Phase I – Cairn Wood
- Phase II – Reservoir Side
- Phase III – Enhancement to Lands at Reservoir Side

He reminded members that to date Council had only agreed to Phase I and the contents of the correspondence referred to fitted well with those proposals. The Director of Community and Wellbeing confirmed that the issue of the transfer of land remained outstanding but that discussions were ongoing with Forest Service, and in particular work was underway to agree a Memorandum of Understanding and a development licence.

**NOTED.**

**EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND,** on the proposal of Councillor Muir, seconded by Councillor Boyle, that the public/press be excluded during the discussion of the undernoted items of confidential business.

(Councillor Adair left the meeting at this stage – 9.26pm)

17. **KILCOOLEY WOMEN’S CENTRE ICON CENTRE – DEFERRED FROM AUGUST COUNCIL MEETING (FILE:CDV30B)**

*****COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE***

*****NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

18. **ITEM WITHDRAWN**
19. **CONCESSION OPPORTUNITY TO OPERATE THE CAFÉ AT NORTH DOWN MUSEUM (FILE: CW100)**

***COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

20. **CONCESSION OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP AND OPERATE A CATERING FACILITY AT THE ARDS BLAIR MAYNE WELLBEING AND LEISURE COMPLEX (FILE REF: PRO107)**

***COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

21. **SINGLE TENDER ACTION – SUPPLY OF SPINNING BIKES FOR ARDS BLAIR MAYNE WELLBEING AND LEISURE COMPLEX (FILE REF: CW109)** (Appendix X)

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

22. **SINGLE TENDER ACTION – PURCHASE OF TRAMPOLINES FOR ARDS BLAIR MAYNE WELLBEING AND LEISURE COMPLEX (FILE REF: CW109)** (Appendix XI)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).
23. WALL OF FAME, ARDS BLAIR MAYNE WELLBEING AND LEISURE COMPLEX (FILE REF: CW109)

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

24. PCSP PRIVATE MINUTES DATED 4 & 25 JUNE 2018 (Appendix XII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

25. REQUEST FOR A LICENCE TO UNDERTAKE WORKS AT THE OLD BANGOR OUTDOOR BATHING POOL (FILE REF: LP330)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

26. RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

TERMINATION OF MEETING

The meeting terminated at 10.17 pm.

Circulated for Information

a) DFI – Ballysallagh Upper Reservoir

NOTED.
September 4th 2018

Re: International Service Design Network Global Conference 2018

Dear Stephen,

As you may know, the Annual Global Service Design Conference takes place in Ireland on October 11th & 12th of this year. Cork County Council has been integral to bringing this conference to Ireland and is proud to be partnering with the Global Service Design Network to host it. The global conference is now in its 11th year and this year over 800 international and national delegates will converge on Dublin Convention Centre for this exciting 2 day event.

We are pleased to announce that the full conference programme has now been finalised. An impressive range of public and private sector speakers from organisations such as NHS Digital UK, Sydney Metro Australia, Los Andes University, King Abdullah’s Economic City (Saudi Arabia), Musgrave Group, Adidas, BMW Group, Virgin Cruises, AirFrance KLM, and IBM have been confirmed. These talks will be supplemented with practical workshops that demonstrate how Service Design tools are being used globally to motivate and empower staff and to achieve improved service delivery models for our customers. A copy of the full conference programme is attached for your information and a discounted public sector ticket rate is available until Friday September 14th.

The theme of this year’s conference Designing to Deliver focuses on the implementation of Service Design practices to achieve meaningful and measurable results. Design is a major factor in contributing to positive customer experience and the transformation of customer services from good to great. In the private sector, design-thinking allows companies to become more competitive and innovative; while in the public sector, design-led innovation can make services more efficient and effective thereby improving quality of life for all.
This conference represents an unique opportunity to learn about design-led innovation and how it can help us public servants to deliver better services for our citizens. I look forward to seeing you and/or your colleagues at the conference in October.

Further information in relation to the conference and links to the public sector ticket rate can be found at www.service-design-network.org

Please feel free to share this information with your colleagues.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

TIM LOCEY, CHIEF EXECUTIVE
CORK COUNTY COUNCIL

Designated Public Official under the Regulation of Lobbying Act 2015
### Afternoon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Level 3 Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 PM</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:15 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:15 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:15 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:15 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Legacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Morning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07:00 AM</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00 AM</td>
<td>Designing Your Brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 AM</td>
<td>Designing Your Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Designing Your Soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Designing Your Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00 PM</td>
<td>Designing Your Legacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Programme

**Day Two - Friday, October 12th**

**Morning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 09:30</td>
<td>Conference opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Auditorium Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 - 09:55</td>
<td><strong>Designing to Deliver Part 2</strong> Listening Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Auditorium Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:55 - 10:00</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Cathy Tolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Auditorium Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 10:30</td>
<td>5 Lessons to Control Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Dar Hayder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Auditorium Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:00</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Level 3 foyer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Level 3 foyer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 12:30</td>
<td><strong>Morning breakout sessions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Limited capacity for track sessions. Please prioritise your conferences using the link</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>under the booking page.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Track 01: Strategy, Leadership, and Empathy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unchartered Territory of Strategic Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Touman Manireen and Ulala Jones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OP Financial Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Creative leadership: Qualities that Foster Creative Teams</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Liza Nilsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exhibition launches as celebrations of a designed process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Eva Lipowetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Slow Hunch: Cultivating Customer-Centric Acceleration through Collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Ann Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Track 02: Delivering in Public</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Designing the Museum Experience: Working Towards Digital Transformation within Cultural Institutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Tricia Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Customer Experience... but for an entire city!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Monica Stephan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 - 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Track 03: Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Beyond Personas: Design of services by smart agents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Santiago Echeverry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Antwerpse AG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 13:30</td>
<td><strong>Track 04: Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Pinball game</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**David Griffith-Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Karin Lycke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Beyond NPS - why the “silver bullet” CX metric misses the mark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 - 14:00</td>
<td><strong>Track 05: Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Blueprinting IOT: Developing Service using Information Value Loop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Shauna Jin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Beyond NPS - why the “silver bullet” CX metric misses the mark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Katie Mombah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Afternoon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 15:30</td>
<td><strong>Afternoon breakout sessions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Limited capacity for track sessions. Please prioritise your conferences using the link</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>under the booking page.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Track 01: Points of Views</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Culture eats strategy for breakfast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Floor Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Track 02: Delivering on Health</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building Design to Deliver</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Tara Wason and Shirley Sarker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Design for Parkinson's Patients</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Milena Soncina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Journey Managers: A Key Role for Service Delivery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Kerry Bodin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30 - 16:00</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Level 3 foyer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 - 16:30</td>
<td><strong>Service Design Awards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Keynote and presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Award presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 - 17:00</td>
<td><strong>Endings and ends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Afternoon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Track 06: Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Blueprinting IOT: Developing Service using Information Value Loop</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Shauna Jin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Beyond NPS - why the “silver bullet” CX metric misses the mark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Katie Mombah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 - 17:15</td>
<td><strong>The Architecture of Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Alberta Soranzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Auditorium Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 - 17:45</td>
<td><strong>Doing is the hard part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Jakob Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Auditorium Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45 - 18:00</td>
<td><strong>Closing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Auditorium Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 10

Ards and North Down Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>26 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>06 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td>TO/VIC2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Travel Awards - Best Visitor Information Centre 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tourism unit has been advised that Bangor Visitor Information Centre has been shortlisted, as one of four Visitor Information Centres in contention for the Northern Travel Awards – Best Visitor Information Centre 2018.

The Awards will be held on the evening of Friday 19th October 2018 in the Slieve Donard Resort and Spa. There are two tickets available for each nominee, to purchase at the cost of £140 + VAT per ticket.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council approves the purchase of two tickets for the Awards, from existing tourism budgets, and further seeks a nomination for an elected representative to attend alongside an officer within the Tourism Service.
The Boundary Commission for Northern Ireland is an independent and impartial public body, which reviews all UK Parliament constituency boundaries in Northern Ireland according to rules established by the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended). There are separate Commissions to review UK Parliament constituencies in England, Scotland and Wales.

On the 24 February 2016, the Boundary Commission for Northern Ireland announced the commencement of the 2018 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies.

In accordance with its statutory duties under Sections 3(1) and 3(2) of the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended), the Boundary Commission for Northern Ireland submitted its Final Recommendations of the 2018 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies to the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland on Wednesday 5 September 2018.

for Northern Ireland. This follows the laying in Parliament of all four UK Boundary Commissions’ Final Recommendations Reports.

A link to this report can be found below


The Boundary Commission’s work on the 2018 Review has now ended. The Government is responsible for laying a single draft Order in Council before Parliament to give effect to the Commissions’ recommendations. The draft order must be voted on and approved by both the House of Commons and the House of Lords before the recommendations come into force. The Commission has no role in this procedure.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that this report is noted.
Ards and North Down Borough Council

At the meeting of the Regeneration and Development Committee on 6 September 2018, it was reported that Ards and North Down Borough Council was a finalist in the ‘Council of the Year’ Award with Social Enterprise NI. It was agreed that the Head of Economic Development along with the Chair of the Regeneration and Development Committee, or nominee, attend the Social Enterprise NI Awards Evening on 19 October 2018 at the Stormont Hotel, Belfast.

Unfortunately, the Chair and Vice Chair are not available on that evening and nominations are sought for a Member to attend this event.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Council nominates a Member to attend the Social Enterprise NI Awards Evening, as finalists for the ‘Council of the Year’ Awards on 19 October 2018, at the Stormont Hotel, Belfast, along with the Economic Development Manager, Karine McGuckin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RECEIVED</th>
<th>NOTICE</th>
<th>SUBMITTED BY</th>
<th>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</th>
<th>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</th>
<th>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</th>
<th>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</th>
<th>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/11/14</td>
<td>Investigate concept behind innovation lab</td>
<td>Councillor Walker</td>
<td>04/12/14</td>
<td>Governance 18.12.14</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/05/15</td>
<td>Permanent recognition of Rory McIlroy in Holywood</td>
<td>Councillor Muir</td>
<td>24/06/15</td>
<td>Corporate Services 13.10.15</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/2/17</td>
<td>War Memorial – Conlig</td>
<td>Councillors Barry and Woods</td>
<td>Council March 2017</td>
<td>Corporate Services Committee April 2017</td>
<td>Agreed in principle pending report</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/8/17</td>
<td>Creating an inclusive beach</td>
<td>Councillor Robinson</td>
<td>Council – Sept 2017</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing Committee – October 17</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Interim report March 2018</td>
<td>Further report November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/17</td>
<td>Foodbanks and distribution Centres</td>
<td>Councillors Woods and Barry</td>
<td>Council – Oct 2017</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing Committee – November 2017</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/11/17</td>
<td>Identified Mental health as a growing area of concern affecting</td>
<td>Councillor Smart</td>
<td>Council – Nov 2017</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing Committee – December 2017</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/18</td>
<td>Consultation with Millisle and Ballycopeland Presbyterian Church about memorial to missionary Amy Carmichael</td>
<td>Councillor Thompson</td>
<td>Council – January 2018</td>
<td>Environment Committee – February 2018</td>
<td>Agreed to bring back report</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/1/18</td>
<td>‘Refill Ards and North Down’ – reusable water bottles</td>
<td>Councillor Woods, Barry and Robinson</td>
<td>Council – January 2018</td>
<td>Environment Committee – February 2018</td>
<td>Agreed to bring back report</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/1/18</td>
<td>Redevelopment of Kinnegar Logistics Base</td>
<td>Alderman McDowell and Councillor Muir</td>
<td>Council – January 2018</td>
<td>Regeneration &amp; Development Committee – February 2018</td>
<td>Agreed to bring back a report</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/18</td>
<td>Removal low level concrete walls Community Hall, Comber and increasing car parking capacity</td>
<td>Councillor Cummings</td>
<td>Council – February 2018</td>
<td>Environment Committee – March 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/18</td>
<td>Memorial Trees and identifying suitable locations for a Borough Memorial</td>
<td>Councillor Walker</td>
<td>Council – February 2018</td>
<td>Community and Wellbeing – March 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/18</td>
<td>Garden and Arboretum and associated costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/3/18</td>
<td>Online community directory</td>
<td>Councillor Douglas</td>
<td>Council – March 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing – April 2018 - deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/3/18</td>
<td>Ballycrochan Linear Park – Green Flag status</td>
<td>Councillor Walker &amp; Councillor Douglas</td>
<td>Council – March 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing – April 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/3/18</td>
<td>WW2 Air Raid Shelter, Ward Park, Bangor</td>
<td>Councillor Martin</td>
<td>Council – March 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing – April 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/3/18</td>
<td>Accessible green space – Town Park in Newtownards</td>
<td>Councillor Smart &amp; Councillor Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – April 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing – May 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/3/18</td>
<td>Modern slavery/human trafficking</td>
<td>Councillor Smith &amp; Councillor Mclveen</td>
<td>Council – April 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services Committee – May 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/5/18</td>
<td>Slip lane entrance to Recycling Centre, Moss Road, Ballygowan</td>
<td>Councillor Cummings and Alderman Gibson</td>
<td>Council – May 2018</td>
<td>Environment Committee – June 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/5/18</td>
<td>Groomsport tennis courts improvements</td>
<td>Councillor Chambers</td>
<td>Council – May 2018</td>
<td>Community and Wellbeing Committee – June 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/5/18</td>
<td>Annual Multi Denominational Service of Thanksgiving for the work of the Emergency Services and First Responders</td>
<td>Councillor Muir</td>
<td>Council – May 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services Committee – June 2018</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/18</td>
<td>New trees in Castle Park, Bangor</td>
<td>Alderman Irvine</td>
<td>Council – June 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing Committee - September 18</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/6/18</td>
<td>Commemorate the centenary of the Midwives (Ireland) NI Act 1918</td>
<td>Councillors Gilmour, Armstrong-Cotter and Cathcart</td>
<td>Council – June 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing Committee - September 18</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/6/18</td>
<td>Attendance statistics for full council and all standing committee meetings</td>
<td>Councillor Muir</td>
<td>Council – June 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services Committee – September 18</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/6/18</td>
<td>Marine pollution</td>
<td>Councillors T Smith and Gilmour</td>
<td>Council – June 2018</td>
<td>Environment Committee - September 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/6/18</td>
<td>People with terminal illnesses / assessment for welfare</td>
<td>Councillor Woods &amp; Menagh</td>
<td>Council – June 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/6/18</td>
<td>Council acknowledging the positive contribution that diversity brings</td>
<td>Councillor Muir</td>
<td>Council – June 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/6/18</td>
<td>Investment at Seapark Tennis Courts, Holywood</td>
<td>Councillor Dunne</td>
<td>Council – July 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing Committee – September 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/6/18</td>
<td>Council support for the roll-out of the Headway Brain Injury card.</td>
<td>Councillor Robinson</td>
<td>Council – July 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services – September 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/6/18</td>
<td>Implementation of the Regional Trauma Network.</td>
<td>Councillor Douglas</td>
<td>Council- July 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services – September 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred to October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/7/18</td>
<td>Urgent review of the 20m rule for PIP Mobility Support and Engagement with Key Stakeholders.</td>
<td>Councillor Douglas</td>
<td>Council – July 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Services – September 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred to October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/7/18</td>
<td>How the Council can facilitate the opening of The Priory in Newtownards during peak tourist periods.</td>
<td>Councillor McIlveen</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Regeneration - Sept 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/7/18</td>
<td>Appropriate signage at Movilla Cemetery</td>
<td>Councillor McIlveen</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing - Sept 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred to October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/7/18</td>
<td>Policy for those who do not display a disability blue badge</td>
<td>Councillor McIlveen</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Environment - Sept 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred to October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/7/18</td>
<td>Investigate introducing a one-way system from Mill street and Castle street, Comber</td>
<td>Councillor Cooper</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Regeneration - Sept 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred to October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/7/18</td>
<td>Remembering Srebrenica</td>
<td>Councillor Douglas &amp; Councillor Muir</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate – October 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/7/18</td>
<td>Expressing our support for the growing demand for a People’s Vote on the final Brexit deal</td>
<td>Councillor Walker</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate - October 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/8/18</td>
<td>Lobbying central government in relation to financial cuts introduced since 2015</td>
<td>Alderman Henry, Councillor</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate – October 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/8/18</td>
<td>Allotments at Bryansburn Road</td>
<td>Alderman Smith &amp; Councillor McClean</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing - Sept 18</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/8/18</td>
<td>Introductions of Finn’s Law</td>
<td>Councillor Cummings</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Environment - Sept 18</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Hanging baskets – roundabout at Main Street, Bangor</td>
<td>Alderman M Smith &amp; Alderman W Irvine</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing - Sept 18</td>
<td>To be ratified September Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Contact Secretary of State re: hate crimes</td>
<td>Councillor T Smith &amp; Councillor C Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing – October 2018</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Development of Gray Point Fort, Helens Bay</td>
<td>Councillor Martin &amp; Dunne</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Regeneration – October 2018</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McClean, Councillor Noelle Robinson & Councillor Tom Smith
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RECEIVED</th>
<th>NOTICE</th>
<th>SUBMITTED BY</th>
<th>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</th>
<th>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</th>
<th>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</th>
<th>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</th>
<th>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Memorial to 8 people killed at 1936 TT Race</td>
<td>Councillor Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate - Oct 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>100th Anniversary of Northern Ireland in 2021</td>
<td>Councillor Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate - Oct 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Criminal gangs taking advantage of the NIHE transfer scheme</td>
<td>Councillor Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate - Oct 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Reinstate the Ulster-Scots greeting of “Fair Faa Ye” to entrance signs to the Borough</td>
<td>Councillor Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate - Oct 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Costs of Sunday musical concerts in Ward Park, Bangor</td>
<td>Councillor Thompson</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Regeneration - Oct 18</td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>