

# **Wrexham Full Council Meeting - Wednesday 18th May 2016**

## **Agenda Item 13 - Notice of Motion**

### ***Council Leader Mark Pritchard (MP) to Councillor John Pritchard (Mayor)***

**MP:** “Mr Mayor, the purpose of this report is to report back to the Executive Board consideration of motions moved of the Council 23<sup>rd</sup> of March 2016 in according with standing order 7.4 of the Councils standing orders. The Executive Board listened carefully to the various speakers both supporting and opposing the motion. A very full debate on the matter was conducted on the 12<sup>th</sup> April 2016, lasting just under an hour and a half. At the end of the debate the Executive Board made the decision contained in the details and published the decision of that meeting.

In summary, the Board having considered its position and previous decisions as requested in the notice of motion concluded that if the Welsh Government decided to list the building the board would consider the implications of that in due course for action.

In the interim, the removal of asbestos will continue in the interests of public safety; any further demolition will wait the decision of the Welsh Government, but if the decision is not to list then the decision of the Executive Board in January will be fully implemented.

I’m quite happy to move this report back to the Council that this notice of motion be noted.

Thank you Chair.”

### **Chair Cllr John Pritchard (JP):**

**JP:** “Thank you. Is there a seconder?”

**Cllr I Roberts:** “Seconded.”

**JP:** “Thank you. Are there any other speakers? Dana?”

### **Cllr Dana Davies (DD):**

**DD:** “Thank you Mr Mayor. Can I also congratulate yourself and David Canon on his appointment to the Labour group.

We'd like to raise some concerns regarding point 2.34 of the report based on recent evidence, not opinions. The original decision to demolish was based on making safe the building and very much on health and safety grounds, and I think the information that we've had today from another recent FOI request could be seen as that decision being influenced by outside areas or groups.

So we would like, the Labour group would like, to table an amendment to the recommendation, and that amendment being ... we're very much directed by the Welsh audit office to make decisions in this chamber and the Executive Board, based on evidence, and we then arrive at the informed decision.

Our amendment is a full evidence-based review involving all members take place; the matter is reconsidered based on that evidence, and that's taking into consideration recent information that we've had to FOI requests, and also questioning that the recent decision presented to all Councillors was based on making safe that property and purely from a health and safety point of view. Thank you."

**JP:** "Thank you. Do we have a seconder?"

**Cllr Kevin Hughes (KH):**

**KH:** "My congratulations on your appointment of Mayor in the ceremony yesterday. I'd like to second that amendment as outlined by Councillor Dana Davies this evening and also point out that I'd like to make a recorded vote also."

**JP:** "Are there more than 10 people to support the amendment?"

**Cllr D J Griffiths (DJG):**

**DJG:** "Chair, I'd like to congratulate you on gaining the office. Can I have more information on what's come through today because I'm not going to vote on something that I'm not aware of? I think it'd be wrong to put to Council ... and whatever that evidence is that's come through, can that be substantiated in the report what's gone on today?"

**JP:** "I'll ask the proposers to confirm the recent news?" <inaudible>

**DD:** "Thank you Mr Mayor. A very, very fair point. We've had all Councillors that are here today, a copy of the FOI request that was submitted by a third-party group

concerning correspondence between this Council and a potential school that could be relocated onto the site of the current Groves school.

The content of that FOI – there is some preference that the school in question would only be entrusted with relocation if they would agree to a new build - and it's very detailed within the content of the FOI; and it mentions a new build in the preference and that the governing body would only take forward a relocation of the school based on a new build and it could be believed strongly, we the Labour group it could be seen that that's what's influencing our decision, or the Executive Board's decision to demolish the existing site.

The correspondence within the FOI that actually states that demolition would be as a result of health and safety or making safe that building. And that's our concern. And based on that, and obviously on the reputation of the Council and the wider implications on how this Council does business, we believe strongly, the Labour group, that we now need a full evidence-based review involving all members; so that we can all look at the information and all draw out the evidence and all base our conclusions on that, because we also feel that all Councillors have been in a position where they've been able to participate in this process and that they has been a lack of information.

There are only certain Councillors that have had all that information. And we feel it's paramount now to carry out a full evidence-based review where we can make sure that we're not being organised by any outside organisations or groups or governing bodies involved in this. Thank you."

**JP:** "Thank you. Just before you sit down, what group has this information come from?"

**DD:** "I've just had a copy of an FOI. My understanding is once this Council releases that FOI that information is then in the public domain."

**JP:** "So we've no idea where this ....<inaudible> .... establishment."

**DD:** "This council has released this information as part of an FOI so that information is in the public domain. That's how I've received it and I believe that's how every other Councillor has received it today as well. Thank you."

**JP:** "OK"

**Cllr Andrew Bailey (AB):**

**AB:** *inaudible* ... “based on this FOI ... the transcript was available at ten past two this afternoon” .... *<inaudible, referring to info on his tablet>* ... “and this is the first opportunity Councillors have had to debate and vote on the issues it raises.”

**JP:** “Thank you, Andrew. Councillor Dave Bithell.”

**Cllr David A Bithell (DAB):**

**DAB:** “Thank you Mr Mayor, and congratulations again on being elected as Mayor.”

*<this part of webcast is indistinct and at times it's inaudible>* ....

“It is to report back on the Executive Board’s consideration of the motion moved on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March. But obviously in the report it notes the position of the Executive Board. That’s all we’ve had today. I’m shocked really that we’ve had an email at 14:07 from “SOS Wales” outlining a FOI request that was requested from the Council. Everyone’s entitled to FOI. I’m not sure how that influences a decision of the Council. We don’t know who it comes from, speculation and assumptions... and we can’t base a decision when we’ve got no hard evidence in front of us.

The Labour group don’t even know who it’s come from – so I’m just going to ask the Legal Officer is it appropriate under our standing orders of constitution that FOI requests, there was no notice given of any questions. This is purely, because that’s where it originates from, so that’s” ....*<inaudible>*.... “Are we as Councillors in a position to deal with FOI requests based on FOI that’s been presented by the Labour group?”

*<Chair Cllr J Pritchard conferring with someone off camera>*

**Trevor Coxon - Head of Corporate and Customer Services (TC):**

**TC:** “Firstly, it is perfectly appropriate to move a relevant amendment to a motion that’s put forward and this relates to the Groves issue so it’s permissible for us to do that.

Secondly, it’s for you to decide whether sufficient evidence has been put forward for you to change your decision. I don’t think I’m party to the information that it is alleged is stating, what it is alleged it is stating, so you have to decide what credence you give to that and vote accordingly.”

**JP:** “Thank you. Councillor Michael Morris.”

*<webcast audio improves at this point>*

**Cllr Michael G Morris (MGM):**

**MGM:** “Thank you Mr Mayor, and congratulations from the Conservative group on your election as Mayor. I just wanted to lead on from ... Councillor Bithell’s has had part of my question answered but it wasn’t clear enough for me to reach a judgement either way on the decision that’s been put forward.

This is a report, as it quite clearly says, the Executive Board resolved after a lengthy debate 1,2,3,4. And we are now being asked to change one of the recommendations made by the Executive Board. It wasn’t a recommendation, it was a resolution of the Board and they obviously have powers to act in this matter.

So I’m just asking again from Trevor, if he could, is it in order, that we, today, could alter a resolution that’s been made by the Board which is just a factual piece of information .

And from what Councillor Bithell says, it’s not a matter of dealing with it on assumptions, it’s a matter of dealing with... I mean, FOI should be factual information that’s been gathered from the authority so I don’t have an issue with that.

It’s the interpretation of that information which has been put forward, and I haven’t read the email in detail, I’ve just scanned it as we have been talking now. It’s the interpretation of that information from a particular action group which is in a sense what Councillor Dana Davies talked about – organisations trying to influence things from outside.

So I’m just wondering if Trevor could clarify are we in order to amend a resolution of the board when it’s an item that they have particular powers to deal with?”

**TC:** “I haven’t read it that way, I must admit, I’ve read that the .. unless I’ve written the proposed amendment down incorrectly, I’ve understood it was a request for a full evidence-based review to take place and the matter be reconsidered based on that evidence.

Now, I’m taking it as read, unless anyone sees it differently, that as the Executive Board, you are perfectly right – the Council cannot replace a decision of the Executive Board with it’s decision. My understanding is that it’s asking

for this to be reconsidered by the Executive Board taking into account this full evidence based review.”

**MGM:** “Perhaps Councillor Davies will correct me if I’m wrong, it was an amendment to 2.3 number 4 as an amendment to that particular item, and that’s what concerns me.”

**JP:** “Is that correct, Councillor Davies?”

**DD:** “No, Mr Mayor, it wasn’t. Our concerns are around the 2.34 plus it was an amendment to recommendation 2.31 rather than it be mooted that we replace that with full evidence based review. And, that the discussion isn’t just about one outside organisation’s influence - if Councillors feel that they are being influenced by them. It’s about being influenced by the information within emails back and to from Officers, Councillors, governing bodies and various other people.”

**JP:** “Cllr Michael Edwards”

**Cllr Mike Edwards (ME):**

**ME:** “I’m not very keen on referring this back simply because of the FOI. That’s not why I’m likely to want reconsideration. I found a call-in paper, many moons ago, it seems now - and we had a discussion about it and I was of the opinion that it should be reconsidered, that this question should be reconsidered, in the light of this evidence that has come forward.

I’m still of that opinion and therefore I would like to see the Executive Board reconsider it in the light of all relevant information. I do not want any mention of a review; I don’t want any mention of the FOI; I merely want the Executive Board to carry out the reconsideration I asked for at the call-in, which was heard by the Customer Performance Scrutiny Committee.

And so, I would like to put in a further amendment that we request the Executive Board to .... That when the Welsh Government has made a decision on the listing that the Executive Board reconsider their decision in the light of all available relevant information.”

**JP:** “Thank you, Councillor Williams... *<speaking to someone off camera>*... Can you repeat that?”

**TC:** “Just on a point of order we need to deal with one amendment at a time. If you want to .. a further amendment when that matter has been dealt with then we will consider that at that point, but if we take a series of amendments we are going to get confused with what we are debating. So if we could take the first issue first, deal with that, and if there still remains a matter you want to put forward as a further amendment then we will deal with that at that point.”

**JP:** “Councillor Hugh Jones”

**Cllr Hugh Jones (HJ):**

**HJ:** “Thank you, Mr Mayor, and congratulations to you on your appointment . I think we need to go back a little bit here because the impression that’s been given today that the decision was made around very limited information. The Corporate Land and Buildings group had two meetings in which it had a very full discussion on the future of this building.

Significantly more information was available to that group than has been referred to today, and obviously, all political groups were represented, or had the opportunity to attend those working parties. Unfortunately, as we already know, and as I’ve made clear in the past, not every group took the opportunity of being present.

And my understanding of the decision, is that the decision to demolish was not made around the narrow circumstances that have been presented us today but were on a number of factors ; the condition of the building, safety to the public, the fact that it was unfit for any further use; the fact that despite several approaches to CADW they had not listed the building; the fact that the cost of adapting the building for future educational use - and we’re all in the Council that is the most appropriate use of that land would make it almost impossible to reach the standard of 21<sup>st</sup> Century education that we all want for this council.

And also the cost of maintaining this building was spiralling out of control not withstanding our Assets and Economic Department to maintain that building.

So I think that we need to try and get back to the fact that on two occasions the Corporate Land and Buildings Working Group had the opportunity of assessing all of this information before it makes its recommendation to the Executive Board. And the Executive Board did not make its decision purely on the basis of correspondence between one school or another.

I have only had a brief opportunity to read that correspondence, sorry, FOI data that came through. My understanding is that it's around correspondence between one school and our Officer and the Council, but in fairness we have to put it into perspective. It was a very considerable, in depth discussion about the future of this building.

I for one was, at one point, at the point where I wanted to save it but I was convinced on the basis of the evidence that we had before us that that was not the right decision either for the future of education in this Council, or, for value for money for ratepayers of Wrexham County Borough. And I changed, from the very first meeting when it was discussed; I indicated that I would not support demolition.

But on the basis of the evidence, full evidence submitted, that the Executive Board was given, that the decision made by the Executive Board was the right decision.

We need to be careful that on the basis of one FOI act we are failing to recognise the amount of information of data that has gone into reaching this decision. And that the decision was reached on a considerable amount of evidence presented both to the Corporate Land and Buildings Group and to the Executive Board. Thank you Mr Mayor."

**JP:** "Thank you. Councillor Michael Williams"

**Cllr Michael Williams (MW):**

**MW:** "Thank you, and congratulations to you on your appointment as Mayor this year.

I want to move away from The Groves School and get back to reality, which has been stated quite eloquently by my colleague in front of me here.

The reason that we decided not to sell the land to Coleg Cambria was because we had become increasingly aware that we needed to consider the needs of children in Wrexham town centre in the future. And that evidence was accumulating that the numbers of people coming to live in Wrexham in the town centre was set to increase, and within the next five or six years we would need to be able to find two schools.

One of these schools was the Roman Catholic Primary School, and I can take you back to the Corporate Land and Buildings Group in 2008 which had raised the issue then but because we did not know what was happening with the land there was no other place we could build it at the time.

That land is education land, and what we want to put on there are two schools; for the demolition of the building is to make enough space for that. It's subsequently become a health risk because we know how many times that



building has been broken into over time with danger to the people who break into it, and the possible repercussions falling back onto the council.

The problem with the Labour group at the minute is that they seem to have forgotten this fact, and you need to turn your attention away from preserving that building and that we need more schools for our children in Wrexham. Thank you, Chair.”

**JP:** “Councillor Carole O’Toole”

**Cllr Carole O’Toole (C O’T):**

**C O’T:**“Thank you Mr Mayor and congratulations on your appointment.

With respect to the last two speakers, I think we’ve gone beyond the original reasons for the decisions made in October, November, January, April 2015 and 2016. I would question that both Land and Buildings meetings provided the opportunity for a full debate. One did more than the other, I understand, so those kinds of issues about how long things should be debated for are always quite personal and subjective, aren’t they, but I’m not so sure that I would particularly agree that we had particularly full debates.

But I think, as I said earlier, I don’t think we need to be rehearsing the reasons for those decisions that were then made. I think a lot has happened since then that has perhaps muddied the waters or compromised some aspects of decision making and for me, and for everybody’s sake I think it’s fair and very important that we restate some of the reasons for decision making and I guess this is a job for the Executive Board- that they relook at reasons for decision making in light of evidence that is more recent.

I can’t lay claim to knowing a huge amount about evidence. We’ve had emails, all of us, as Councillors, comments have been made in the press and now we’ve had this email this morning, which I haven’t had a chance to download the links.

I think what we’re looking at now is moving on reviewing the position and making a decision which is evidentially based on strong arguments for whichever decision they intend to make going forward, whether it’s the one stated in the report or indeed any other decision they choose to make during the future. Thank you.”

**JP:** “Thank you. Councillor Alun Jenkins, and this is the last speaker now.”

**Cllr Alun Jenkins AJ):** *Speaking in Welsh.*

**AJ:**

*<another quiet voice, simultaneously translating into English - impossible to hear properly what either are saying>*

*<AJ continues in English but the sound quality is extremely poor - barely audible in fact>*

“.. and I hadn't intended to make a comment today, so I'm having to rely very much on this box *<points to his head>* instead of my computer, which I usually refer to.

*<sound returns>*

I have seen the email, but I haven't even opened it to see its contents, so I don't know what's in it. I must comment though on what was said about Land and Buildings, because I'm a member of Land and Buildings and I was quite miffed at the time at the unsatisfactory way in which this matter was dealt with.

We saw this report in October, and we had quite a lengthy debate. We asked for more information, and a very lengthy document came to us in November . That was divided into a number of sections , and we started I think at 1 o'clock; we went through the first section, we came to 10 to 2 and the Lead Member said, "Sorry, we've got another meeting now, we've got to go, can we please recommend to the Executive Board that this building be demolished".

My response to that was - that we needed to enter into some sort of Consultation Event with the public, before such a decision was made. No, there wasn't time to do that, and in any case, I wasn't seconded, and that motion was not put. The recommendation went to the Executive Board in January. We could have had a dozen meetings between November and January with the public; we could have had that consultation. But we chose not to, and I'm disappointed in that.

I think that with regard to the two amendments that we've got - I don't think there's a great deal between them. I think we're in the position now where the Council is being drawn into disrepute over this, and we need to get out of that position.

The only way we can do that is to have a complete review, call it a review, call it what you like - let's get all the facts together, whether from this FOI document and the documents we were given in November - we didn't go through them, I've got them all in my computer, I've got all the paper copies at home. We didn't go through them, there wasn't time.

We need to make up for this, very desperately. I'm very supportive of a review, be they Mike's amendments or Dana's amendments. Can they be rolled into

one? I think we're all saying the same thing, we need the review. I'm happy to vote for it."

**JP:** "I did say that would be the last speaker, but Derek has put his hand up."

**Cllr Derek Wright (DW):**

**DW:** "Thanks for letting me come in and congratulations to you and your wife, to Bernie and his wife.

To continue from what Alun said, this has gone way past anything that could have been predicted, and to bring this Council back into public regard, this matter has killed this council as far as I'm concerned.

In my ward, seven miles away from Wrexham, all the questions I get are about this school - what has the Council done? Surely what we need here is to clear the air, get all the facts on the table, whatever can be published be published, and whatever goes into part two will be done with the whole of the councillors, all fifty two of us, not ten, fifty two - where we can all see exactly what the evidence is, on Dana's lines, to what Mike is proposing.

What we need to do now is to publish all the information we've got, bring back some respect to the fifty two of us because it's been lost as far as I'm concerned, and that's all the Labour group are asking for.

We want a full review; we don't want to change anything, we want all the items published and we want a full review so that the whole of the County Borough can see what's gone on with this, because I'm fed up with being asked about it and I'm sure Mark does, because he gets it daily. Thank you, Chair."

**JP:** "Thank you, Derek. Leader, Mark ...?"

**MP:** "Yes, thank you Mr Mayor. First of all, I'll come back to the report in front of us, I think. If you look at it, it's Notice of Motion, recommendation that the report be noted, and that's what I brought it for here today. I am very disappointed, and quite alarmed, to hear from certain members what I've heard this evening. And what I would say, I'm delighted that this authority took the decision some time ago to take this opportunity to put the webcam in so all Council meetings are recorded, and it's there for fact, for the future.

But coming back to this motion, I don't know what extra information any elected member needs within this council chamber. And I took notes, which I don't usually do, but I think on this occasion I need to.

Dana, you said lack of information. What more information do you want on this? Every email that has been drafted by every elected member has gone out to the public, and I authorised that, so that every <????> here and being said. And it's gone through the scrutiny process, the call-in, it went to Land and Buildings - I don't agree with the two elected members that sit on the front here what said there wasn't an opportunity to debate it. Yes there was. That opportunity was there for you as elected members to debate that on the day. We've gone through the process.

I can go back as far as 2008 it's been empty for 15 years. Michael has said with regards to education provision don't take your eye off the ball here - the issue is catering for children's needs within Wrexham. We want to put two new schools on that site. What's wrong with that? Nothing at all. I really don't know what more elected members want from this. I really don't. I'm perplexed with it. In fact, it's come political, and that's what I'm disappointed with, and it's come personal, and you can shake your head but it has become personal.

Coming back to this here in front of us today that we want to note the motion. I won't support what's being proposed here today by Dana or Arwen and I won't support the amendment. Really, and I'm struggling with it, because I've exhausted this, what more do you want? Because everything you've asked for in the past, you've had. Going into the ... you can have what you like.

There's two issues here. If CADW list the building, well, so be it, and that's a fact, nothing wrong with that at all. If they don't, we will progress to demolish it to put schools on that site. Now when you say, and Derek said, am I fed up with it, and yes, Derek, I am, but I have as many people come to me and say, keep going, and don't give in to pressure, lead, as a Leader, and don't let little groups try and run this Council, because for every person what comes to me to say 'I don't agree with you on the Groves, I have ten others saying, 'you need education in this town.'

And I think the people what put the covenants on the site in the past, I've said it before, and I'll say it again, are visionaries; they knew that this town would grow and the heart and soul of this town would need education - schools - and that's why they put the covenants on it. What is wrong with demolishing a school and putting two new schools on the site? In my opinion - nothing. And I come back to the Groves. At this moment in time, it isn't listed. So why would we treat it any differently from any other school?

We've knocked schools down in Ruabon; in the Rhos; in Rhostyllen; in Queen's Park; we do it all the time. We've done it no differently. It's gone through the political process. It's gone through the call-in. I really don't know what more you want. I really don't. But we are where we are with it, but I won't support what you're proposing here today to note it.

But I really am struggling here today to understand what yourselves, as the Labour group, want out of this. Because it is political. It's personal. And it's

wrong. And that's where I am. But I'll come back to it, and I'm quite happy to move that the recommendations that the report be noted. Thank you."

**JP:** "Right. And we do have a seconder for that, don't we? The first amendment has been proposed and seconded, and if our legal officer Mr Trevor Coxon can read it out."

**TC:** "Yes, thank you Mr Mayor, and I think we should just clarify one or two points on it. The Amendment is not to the Executive Board's decision, because obviously that cannot be amended. It is to the recommendation that the report today be noted, and I am taking it that the extra words are:

The report be noted, and that a full, evidence-based review involving all members takes place and the matter be reconsidered - and I'm putting this in now - by the Executive Board - because the Council cannot replace its decision - based on that evidence. So would you like me to read that again, so that everybody is clear is what the amendment is, or is everybody clear?"

**Cllr R J Dutton (RJD):**

**RJD:** "You didn't offer the mover of the motion or the mover of the amendment a right of reply. Is it in order to offer that?"

**TC:** "The mover of the motion was the Leader, and the Leader has just given his reply. The mover of the amendment does not have a right of second speaking.

So, is everybody clear what they are now voting upon?

That the amendment is, effectively, "to carry out a full evidence- based review involving all members and that the matter be reconsidered by the Executive Board based on that evidence."

A recorded vote has been called for, so I'll now read everybody's name out. If you wish to vote for that amendment, obviously it's 'FOR', if against, it's 'AGAINST' - or if you abstain it won't be recorded as such, as an abstention. So, we'll start."

**JP:** "Just a minute, Councillor David Taylor?"

**Cllr David Taylor (DT):**

**DT:** “Sorry, can I ask on what evidence? On the amendment, you’ve put in new evidence – what evidence?”

**TC:** “Sorry, I’ll read it again. “A full, evidenced-based review involving all members take place, and the matter be reconsidered by the Executive Board based on that evidence.”

I am taking it ‘it is the evidence that would be presented through that review process.”

**JP:** “OK, are we all clear now? Councillor Joan Lowe?”

**Cllr Joan M Lowe (JML):**

**JML:** “Can I ask.... *<inaudible>* .... my request come into it? I now see it on my iPad, I haven’t had chance to read it, but it does say in it, a little bit about the key points to take away from these documents, so it’s somebody who’s looked at the documents and they’re making those key points, so... I’m not happy with that at all, because everybody can look at documents and read them and come to conclusions in a different way.”

**JP:** “OK, thank you Councillor Joan Lowe. I’m now going to take the first amendment now, and we’ll go to the board. All those in favour?”

**TC:** “No, no, no, we’re doing it by a recorded vote.”

*<TC then calls Councillors in alphabetical order (by surname); Councillors respond accordingly>*

Cllr Andrew Bailey: For the amendment

Cllr William Baldwin *<repeats his name>*: Against

Cllr David A Bithell: Against

Cllr I David Bithell: For the amendment

Cllr Paul Blackwell: For

Cllr Brian Cameron: For

Cllr Christa Childs: For

Cllr Dana Davies: For  
Cllr Bob Dutton: Against  
Cllr Mike Edwards: For  
Cllr Terry Evans: Against  
Cllr Anne Evans: For  
Cllr Keith Gregory: For  
Cllr D J Griffiths: Against  
Cllr G W Griffiths: For  
Cllr Kevin Hughes: For  
Cllr P Jeffers: Against  
Cllr Alun Jenkins: For  
Cllr Hugh Jones: Against  
Cllr Arfon Jones: For  
Cllr David Kelly: <no response>

**JP:** "He's declared an interest."

**TC:** "Of course, my apologies."

Cllr J A Kelly: Absent  
Cllr Lloyd Kenyon: Against  
Cllr Geoff Lowe: For  
Cllr Joan Lowe: Against  
Cllr Bernie McCann: Against  
Cllr Mike Morris: Against  
Cllr Carole O'Toole: For  
Cllr Mark Owens: Apologies  
Cllr Paul Pemberton: Against

Cllr John Phillips: Against  
Cllr Colin Powell: For  
Cllr Ron Prince: Against  
Cllr John Pritchard: Against  
Cllr Mark Pritchard: Against  
Cllr Ian Roberts: Against  
Cllr JMB Roberts: Against  
Cllr Neil Rodgers: Against  
Cllr Paul Rodgers: Against  
Graham Rodgers: For  
Cllr Barbara Roxborough: For < ?inaudible?>  
Cllr Robby Skelland: Abstain < ?inaudible?>  
Cllr David Taylor: Abstain  
Cllr Rob Walsh: For  
Cllr Andy Williams: For  
Cllr Michael Williams: Against  
Cllr Steve Wilson: Abstain  
Cllr Derek Wright: For

**TC:** “Has everybody here either voted or abstained? Thank you.”

**JP:** “OK, we have the results. In favour 20, against 22, abstentions 3, therefore it’s lost. We now have the amendment number two. Councillor Mike Edwards.”

**ME:** “Thank you Mr Mayor. I won’t take long over this. I think we want all reference to the FOI taken out, and therefore when the Welsh Government make a decision on the listing of the building, that the Executive Board reconsider their decision, taking into account relevant information that has become available in the meantime. Thank you.”



**JP:** “Could we have a seconder for the second amendment please?”

**C O'T:** “Yes, Mr Mayor, I'll second that amendment”

**JP:** “OK, I'll get Trevor Coxon, the Legal Officer, to read the second amendment out. OK.”

**DD:** “Point of order, Chair. Can we just have clarification. We tied at 20-20 with 3 abstentions on the original amendment?”

**TC:** “Well, two of us have counted this and we've got 20 for, 22 against, and 3 people abstained.

I'll read the second amendment. The second amendment will be to add the words, ‘ when the Welsh Government has made a decision on listing the Groves building, that the Executive Board reconsider their decision in the light of all relevant information which has become available in the meantime.’”

**JP:** “I'll now put the second amendment up for the vote. Sorry, Councillor Hugh Jones, you wanted to speak.”

**HJ:** “It was just a point of order, Mr Mayor, and some guidance from Mr Coxon. How does this amendment differ from the amendment we've just voted on, because my understanding is, reading it, or listening to it, that the substance is the same as the amendment we've just voted on, apart from a few words, that don't actually alter the substance of the amendment.”

**JP:** “Councillor Michael Williams, do you want to come in?”

**MW:** “Well, the difference is simply that there's no reference to the FOI which I don't think we should be considering at this point, and also it doesn't necessarily involve a debate by all fifty two members. It refers it back properly to the Executive Board, they have to take the decision, not the fifty two members, and I don't want it to be thought by the public as such. That the proper way to do this is for the Executive to consider it, and in the light of all evidence available.”

**JP:** “Sorry Councillor Edwards. What it is, there’s no difference there’s no mention of the FOI in the first amendment, either.”

**MW:** “Sorry Mr Mayor. Just on this point of order, my understanding was unless I’m wrong, Councillor Davies, the amendment was to vote it back to the Executive Board with all relevant information. This is exactly what we are being asked to vote on again, in substance, my submission is, Mr Mayor, that there is actually no difference so how can we vote for an amendment that is exactly the same in fact to the amendment we’ve just voted on?”

**TC:** “Thank you I understand what you are saying. In terms of the explanation you’ve been given by Councillor Edwards, I think you are right, there is no reference in the previous motion, the previous amendment, to the FOI, that just happened to be the circumstances that has generated the amendment being put forward.

The difference between the two is the addition of the further consideration would await the outcome of the listing of the Groves building by the Welsh Government, and therefore I think it potentially an altered amendment to the previous one. But, it is the Mayor’s decision, not mine.”

**JP:** “Councillor David A Bithell.”

**DAB:** “Thank you Mr Mayor, we’re making heavy weather of this today. I’m just looking at the report, the substantive report, 2.3 Roman numeral 2. Just take us back to the Executive Board where we debated this. The Council give us an undertaking that if we debated this if this Groves school was listed, and I remember this vividly, that we would consider the next steps.

If you look at Roman numeral 2, ‘if the Welsh Governmentt decide to list the former Groves High School building then members will consider the implication of that action. And to be fair, to the Council, he’s given that undertaking that the Executive Board. So I really don’t see why we’re making heavy weather of this, this afternoon. Lead has given us an undertaking, it’s written in the report, and I’m quite happy that this is not a valid amendment and it should be ruled out.”

**JP:** “Yes, thank you Councillor David Bithell. Just come back to Councillor Michael Edwards, do you agree that it is too similar, or do you prefer the amendment takes place? You haven’t changed your mind?”

**ME:** "I haven't changed my mind because we don't know when this decision will be made and in the meantime there may be even more evidence. I want all available evidence be considered up until the time that ... to be taken into account."

**JP:** "OK. I've decided that we'll put the second amendment up for the report, so I'll put it up for the recommendations to the vote, all those in favour?"

**TC:** "I'm sorry, can you PLEASE put your hand up, because someone has put their hand up since the last vote, all those in favour, please."

**JP:** "Against"

**TC:** "Sorry, please."

**JP:** "Any abstentions? OK so that is 22 in favour, 21 against, 2 abstentions, so that is carried."