

COUNCILLOR GLADYS SANDIFORD, MAYOR

MINUTES OF: THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF ROSSENDALE

Date of Meeting: 28th September 2011

PRESENT: The Mayor Councillor Sandiford (in the Chair)
Councillors Aldred, A. Barnes, L. Barnes, Cheetham, Crawforth, Driver, Eaton, Essex, Evans, Farrington, Gill, Gledhill, Graham, Jackson, Kenyon, Lamb, McInnes, MacNae, Marriott, May (part), Milling, Morris, Neal, Nuttall, Oakes, Pilling (part), Roberts, Robertson, Serridge, Shipley, D. Smith, M. Smith, Steen and Wilkinson.

IN ATTENDANCE: Helen Lockwood, Chief Executive
Stuart Sugarman, Director of Business
Fiona Meechan, Director of Customers and Communities
Liz Sandiford, Head of People and Policy
Carolyn Sharples, Committee and Member Services Manager
Pat Couch, Scrutiny Support Officer
Jenni Cook, Committee Officer
Michelle Hargreaves, Committee and Member Support Officer
Elaine Craven, Civic Services Officer
Chris Holden, Facilities Technician
Mike Riley, Communities Manager
Phil Seddon, Head of Finance and Property Services
Steve Jackson, Head of Health, Housing and Regeneration
George Taylor, Mayor's Attendant
Bernard Gwyn, Mayor's Attendant

ALSO PRESENT: Lancashire County Councillor Winder
Lancashire County Councillor Steen
3 representatives of the press
132 members of the public

The Mayor announced that that owing to the recommendations made by the Standards Committee on the 20th September, item F3a Recommendations from Internal Audit, had been withdrawn from the agenda pending further investigations and report to the Standards Committee. This would allow their recommendations to come before Council in December.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were submitted by Councillor Stansfield.

2. MINUTES

Resolved:

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 20th July be signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

3. URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS

The Mayor reported that there was one urgent item of business. The Leader of the Council urged councillors and members of the public to sign an e-petition regarding the maternity, neonatal and paediatric units at Fairfield General Hospital.

Resolved:

That this council formally opposes the closure of the Maternity, Neonatal and Paediatric Units at Fairfield General Hospital in the interests of Rossendale residents who utilise these important local services. The Council once again reconfirms its resolution that Maternity Services at Fairfield General Hospital should be retained.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Minute item 14 – Councillor Pilling declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he had a close connection with the tennis club and was affected by the proposals.

Minute item 14 – Councillor Aldred and Councillor Morris declared a personal interest as they were the Council’s representatives on the board of Rossendale Leisure Trust.

Minute item 3 – Councillor McInnes declared a personal interest as she was an employee of Pennine Acute Trust.

5. OUTSTANDING ITEMS OF BUSINESS FROM THE LAST MEETING

There were no outstanding items to report.

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following issues were raised by members of the public and were answered by the Leader or designated person:

No	Issue	Questioner	Answered by (and action)
1.	Future consultation with residents and the impact on communities. Formation of residents groups for matters which involve the community. Consulting before proposals come to the Chamber. Review of the Community Engagement Strategy.	Mrs L. Ham	Councillor A.Barnes
2.	Consultation regarding the decision. Farm collections an excellent service to residents. Rural residents don't get many services e.g. street lighting. Loss of a basic service. Concerns about hygiene and public health.	Mr T. Higgins	Councillor A.Barnes

7. REFUSE CHANGES

The Council considered the Petition submitted by Mr Alan Walker, the Notice of Motion submitted by Councillors Neal and Pilling, and the Refuse Changes report.

Mr Alan Walker presented the petition on behalf of residents who had signed the 1915 signature petition. In presenting the petition Mr Walker highlighted the following:

- Petition was raised in 3 weeks.
- Wide opposition to the changes.
- Press coverage.
- Cuts to frontline services.
- Consultation with residents and those affected near collection points beforehand.
- Fly tipping concerns.
- Evaluation of collection sites.
- Notified about changes on 26th May 2011.
- Goodwill collections.
- Information on the website.
- Examples of how residents would have to present their waste e.g. the elderly.
- More robust consultation.
- Statutory service required by law.

Councillor Neal formally moved the motion which was seconded by Councillor Pilling as follows: “that following the proposed policy on refuse collection/dropping off points for the borough wide outlying cottages and farm properties, following the decision made by the then cabinet meeting on the 26th January 2011, which was followed by the ratification at the full council on the 23rd February 2011. That these decisions be rescinded with immediate effect, and that all these outlying cottages and farms, also be offered the same recycling waste collection services as all other residents, here in Rossendale, if this notice of motion receives the support of elected members of this council, we would request that this notice of motion comes into effect immediately.”

Councillor Essex moved an amendment which was seconded by Councillor D.Smith, “that following the proposed policy on refuse collection/dropping off points for the borough wide outlying cottages and farm properties, following the decision made at the full council on the 23rd February 2011. That these decisions be rescinded with immediate effect, and following the outcome of recent consultations and additional information becoming available all these outlying cottages and farms, also be offered the same recycling waste collection services as all other residents, here in Rossendale, if this notice of motion receives the support of elected members of this council, we would request that this notice of motion comes into effect immediately.”

A recorded vote was requested by Councillors Serridge, A.Barnes and Lamb.

In considering the amendment members discussed the following:

- Previous Cabinet made the decision.

Voting took place on the amendment, the results of which were as follows:

Cllr Aldred	Against
Cllr A Barnes	Against
Cllr L Barnes	For
Cllr Cheetham	For
Cllr Crawforth	Against
Cllr Driver	For
Cllr Eaton	For
Cllr Essex	For
Cllr Evans	For
Cllr Farrington	Against
Cllr Gill	Against
Cllr Gledhill	For
Cllr Graham	For
Cllr Jackson	Against
Cllr Kenyon	Against
Cllr Lamb	Against
Cllr McInnes	Against
Cllr MacNae	Against
Cllr Marriott	Against
Cllr Milling	For
Cllr Morris	For
Cllr Neal	Against
Cllr Nuttall	Against
Cllr Oakes	Against
Cllr Pilling	Against
Cllr Roberts	Against
Cllr Robertson	Against
Cllr Sandiford	For
Cllr Serridge	Against
Cllr Shipley	For
Cllr D Smith	For
Cllr M Smith	Against
Cllr Steen	For
Cllr Wilkinson	Against
For	14
Against	20
Abstentions	0

The amendment was lost.

Councillor Lamb, the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services presented the Refuse Changes report to members.

In considering the report, notice of motion and the petition members discussed the following:

- Consultation should have been earlier.
- Individual site visits required.
- Letter to be sent to residents on 18th October.
- Importance of accurate consultation and refreshing the citizens' panel.
- Training on reversing vehicles and safety issues.
- Meetings with ward residents.
- Consultation not started till after the elections.
- Key actions about communication in the Cabinet and Council reports in 2010/2011.
- Consultation started with the Haslingden triangle.
- Report went to Policy Overview and Scrutiny.
- Support the notice of motion.
- Factual information on Community Impact Assessment page 1.
- Not spoken to the press.
- Take on board the report and comments from Mrs Ham and Mr Walker.
- £2.7million cuts over three years will affect frontline services.
- Too late to consult once the decision is made.
- Changes to frontline services must be consulted on.
- Why no consultation before elections?
- Did the MP realise his own party made this change?
- Consultation in Eden Ward.
- Partnership working with other Councils.
- Using the Neighbourhood Forums to raise concerns.
- More effective use of local knowledge.
- Health and safety issues and incidents with wagons.
- Reinstate bin collections.

Councillor A.Barnes moved and Councillor Lamb seconded the recommendations of the report.

Resolved:

1. For those farm, rural and other harder to reach properties which have had changes introduced as a result of the policy decision made in February 2011:
 - a. The point of collection prior to the policy decision in February 2011 to be re-introduced; and
 - b. Alternate weekly refuse/recycling collections to continue.
2. For those farm, rural and other harder to reach properties which, due to extended consultation, have not yet had changes introduced as a result of the policy decision made in February 2011:
 - a. The point of collection prior to the policy decision in February 2011 to be maintained; and

- b. Alternate weekly refuse/recycling collections to be introduced.
- 3. The additional cost associated with refuse collection for 2011-12 be funded from other budget savings as identified in the Council's monthly Financial Monitoring reports.

N.B. Councillor May joined the meeting for the remaining items.

8. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR, THE LEADER OR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

The Mayor reported that two letters of thanks had been received, the first was from the Office of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge thanking the Council for their congratulations and well wishes regarding the Royal Wedding. The second letter was from the Royal Norwegian Embassy, for the Council's words of kindness and concern following the events in Norway on the 22nd July.

The Leader of the Council had no communications to report.

The Chief Executive had no communications to report.

9. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

The following issues were raised by Councillors and answered by the Leader or designated person:

No	Issue	Questioner	Answered by (and action)
1.	Confirmation that the period of reflection was necessary.	Councillor Shipley	Councillor A.Barnes
2.	Councils response to the Government Consultation on Changes to Planning Rules for Gypsies	Councillor D.Smith	Councillor A.Barnes
3.	State of the swimming pool in Haslingden and quotes from the Leader and Portfolio Holder for Transport. Did they agree with the Pool Condition Survey?	Councillor Gledhill	Councillor A.Barnes
4.	Additional Cabinet position leading to the paying of additional Councillor allowances. Consideration of job-share?	Councillor Essex	Councillor A.Barnes
5.	Would the purchase of the Valley Centre be good value for money?	Councillor Evans	Councillor A.Barnes
6.	Re-establishment of the Winter Maintenance Liaison Group. Is it cross party?	Councillor Steen	Councillor A.Barnes
7.	Long term commitment for swimming provision in Haslingden and the	Councillor Kenyon	Councillor A.Barnes

	revitalisation of all town centres.		
8.	Progress made on closing police stations and provision of a visible police presence in towns. Recent riots and need for police.	Councillor McInnes	Councillor A.Barnes
9.	Progress update on the Vocational Training Centre at Stubbylee Hall. Falling behind schedule and the need for continuous monitoring.	Councillor Oakes	Councillor MacNae
10.	Household Waste Recycling Centre and supporting County Councillors in keeping them both open. Why were County Councillors not on the response group?	Councillor Morris	Councillor A.Barnes

ORDINARY BUSINESS

10. POLLING DISTRICT AND PLACES REVIEW

The Council considered the Polling District and Places Review.

In considering the report members discussed the following:

- The current Waterfoot Primary School site will close in December, what provision will there be if there are no premises for the polling station?
- Loss of Cowpe polling station.
- Re-visit the number of councillors and reduce the costs across the borough.
- Stonefold RHA and RHB to remain as two polling districts.
- Polling station at Hud Hey does not seem far from Worsley Park, but people would need to cross the by-pass.

Councillor Wilkinson moved an amendment that RHA and RHB remain as two polling districts and that the polling station was put back at Hud Hey. Councillor Serridge seconded the amendment and added to it as follows: that RHA be renamed as HW1, RHB be renamed as HW2, RHC/RHD be renamed as HW3 and RHE be renamed as HW4.

In considering the amendment members discussed the following:

- Baker Street was closer to the Civic Hall polling station.

The Chief Executive clarified that it was a legal requirement to carry out a review and that it was an administrative task of renaming and reviewing polling districts. Only one polling station would be affected which was St Paul's Centre.

Members continued to discuss the following:

- If two polling districts had been merged there was no possibility of going back.
- Wallbank voters and the location of the polling station.

The Chief Executive clarified each recommendation and the amendments made.

Members voted on each of the recommendations and amendments. These were carried and became the substantive motion.

Resolved:

That full Council resolves the following with the amendment to 5.7, that RHA and RHB remain as two separate polling districts and that RHA be renamed as HW1, RHB be renamed as HW2, RHC/RHD be renamed as HW3 and RHE be renamed as HW4:

1. That full Council resolve the amendments to polling district boundaries as listed in the report at paragraph 5.7 as amended.
2. That full Council resolve the merging of polling districts as listed in the report at paragraph 5.7 as amended.
3. That full Council resolve the re-naming of polling districts as recommended by the Cross Party Working Group and listed in the report at paragraph 5.7 as amended.
4. That full Council resolve recommendations to the (Acting) Returning Officer regarding the location of polling stations and listed in the report at paragraph 5.7 as amended.

11. URGENT DECISIONS

The Mayor reported that the Cabinet had not taken any urgent decisions since the last meeting.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET AND OTHER COMMITTEES

12a. Recommendation of the Standards Committee and Performance Overview and Scrutiny: Local Government Ombudsman's Annual Letter for the Year Ended 31st March 2011 and Annual Complaints Review.

The Council considered the Local Government Ombudsman's Annual Letter for the Year Ended 31st March 2011 and the Annual Complaints Review.

In considering the report members discussed the following:

- Template letter used from the Ombudsman with no compliments on achievements.
- Address details wrong.
- Collection of post.

Resolved:

That the contents of the Local Government Ombudsman's Annual Letter for the Year Ended 31st March 2011 and the Annual Complaints Review be noted.

12b. Recommendation of the Governance Working Group: Constitution Review

The Council considered the amendments proposed to the Constitution.

In considering the report members discussed the following:

- Notifying the Mayor when leaving the room had not yet been approved.
- Courtesy to notify the Mayor.
- 10.1 verbal questions and restricting to one written question.
- If more than one written question submitted which one would be taken?
- Part 5 section 9, why was Trade Union membership exempt from requirements?
- Interests posted on the web like the suggestion for members.
- Ability to raise questions in case of an emergency.
- Opportunity for oral questions at the discretion of the Mayor.
- Taking one written question to try to make it equal.
- Giving opportunities for more people to ask questions.
- Taking one written question then take verbal questions if time is left.

Councillor A.Barnes moved an amendment which was seconded by Councillor Serridge to agree the proposed changes to the Council's Constitution with the exception of 10.1 Questions by Members, which would return to the Governance Working Group and that with regards to Personal Interests of Officers, declaring Trade Union membership would no longer be exempt.

Members voted on the amendment, which was carried and became the substantive motion.

Resolved:

That the proposed changes to the Council's Constitution be agreed with the exception of 10.1 Questions by Members, which would return to the Governance Working Group, and that Trade Union membership would not be exempt from declarations of Personal Interests by Officers.

N.B. Councillor Pilling left the meeting for the remaining items as he had declared a personal and prejudicial interest.

13. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC PROJECTS)

The following issues were raised by members of the public and were answered by the Leader or designated person:

No	Issue	Questioner	Answered by (and action)
1.	Refusal to make public the structural survey. Delay plans for Valley Centre. Damage and loss of the pool would affect the health and wellbeing of people in Haslingden. Life expectancy	Miss J. Goodenough	Councillor A.Barnes

	if no repairs are carried out and estimate of costs.		
2.	Description of Option 2 in the consultation included continued maintenance of Haslingden pool, the report makes no reference, is this an oversight? How can you vote if you don't know what the costs are going to be?	Mr J. Lund	Councillor A.Barnes
3.	Item H biased in favour of Valley Centre and negative about the pool option. Overwhelming public support for Haslingden pool.	Mrs L. Lund	Councillor A.Barnes
4.	Three areas previously considered, Rawtenstall Gateway, reducing expenditure, and Rossendale Leisure Trust. Past differences in relation to financial support. Will the Council fully support the leisure trust?	Mrs E. Freeman	Councillor A.Barnes
5.	Been disappointed since the debate restarted regarding Haslingden swimming pool. Public views being ignored. Consultation showed 90% in favour of the pool and 5% in favour of regeneration. Guarantee that the existing pool will be kept open regardless of repairs, until a new pool is built at the sports centre.	Mr E. Davies	Councillor A.Barnes

14. COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC PROJECTS

The Council considered the petition and the Council's Strategic Projects report.

Mr John Lund presented the petition on behalf of residents who had supported the 8122 signature petition. In presenting the petition Mr Lund highlighted the following:

- Haslingden Pool is used by 11 schools and caters for swimming clubs.
- Users include over 50s, mothers and toddlers, it has aqua fit and swimming lessons.
- People learn life skills, how many lives has Haslingden Pool saved?
- People benefit from exercise.
- It has saved the NHS millions over the years.
- Marl Pits couldn't meet the demands if Haslingden closed.
- Two pools in Rossendale would not meet the recommendations of Sport England for sport provision.
- Pool is in a poor condition.
- 2008 report concludes that refurbishment is not a viable option.
- New pool would be better, cheaper to operate and would make good business sense.
- £300,000 of tax payers money wasted if the pool project did not go ahead.

- The design was complete, budget agreed and then the project stopped.
- Over 8,000 had signed the petition.
- It was immoral to promise a new pool and then use the money to knock down the Valley Centre.
- Public consultation on website showed 627 wanted new pool, a mere 31 responded to Option 2.
- The case for the new pool is about people's lives and well being.
- Leading group betraying the trust of the people of Rossendale.
- If new pool is not built now it will never be built.
- Officers should show impartiality, but have been prejudicial against the pool.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor A.Barnes, reported that Mr Lund had made serious allegations about Council Officers and requested that the allegations be put in writing and sent to her direct. The Leader then presented the Council's Strategic Projects report and referred to the Stock Condition Survey which had been circulated to members.

Councillor A.Barnes moved and Councillor Serridge moved the following recommendations:

- Council postpones the 2010 proposal for the redevelopment of a replacement swimming pool at Haslingden Sports Centre in favour of supporting the wider regeneration of Rossendale.
- Council allocates up to £2.5m of Council resources in supporting the regeneration of Rossendale and in particular the acquisition, demolition and remediation of the Valley Centre into a useable and viable site. Council to authorise the Director of Business, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Regeneration and Finance & Resources, enter into and conclude formal contractual arrangements.
- Council and its officers to continue to work with and support Rossendale Leisure Trust in promoting leisure and health across Rossendale and maximise the use of our three leisure facilities managed by the Trust.

Councillor Essex moved and Councillor D.Smith seconded an amendment as follows:

- Complete the development of the swimming pool facilities within the Haslingden sports centre and that a £1.5m Borough-wide Regeneration Fund be established from the Borough's earmarked reserves. The Leader and Cabinet are instructed to bring a plan of regeneration projects to the December Full Council.

In considering the amendment members discussed the following:

- Value for money.
- Public consultation, engaging external consultants.
- Invest to save scheme.
- Reducing opportunities of the Leisure Trust.
- Savings of relocating the Kay Street offices next to the pool.
- New gym facilities with 1300 members, solely financed by the Leisure Trust.
- Option 1 would be the largest investment ever undertaken.
- Would bring construction and supply jobs into the valley straight away.

- Tarmac issues addressed.
- Survey sent to councillors last night.
- Could there be a ruling on whether the survey could be discussed.?

In response to a question regarding the Stock Condition Survey for Haslingden Pool, the Chief Executive clarified that it could be discussed in the Chamber as it would add value to the discussion.

Members continued to discuss the following:

- Condition deteriorated since 2008.
- Significant failure expected within 5 years.
- Commitment to provide three pools.
- Benefit to young people and for generations to come.
- Pleased timetable has been published for the first time.
- Supportive for re-development of Valley Centre.
- NNDR figures incorrect – figures allocated to private sector owner.
- No mention about current economic crisis.
- Demolition over the next year, open space for events not a car park.
- Cultural district.
- Support for amendment.
- Informed decision after understanding business propositions.
- What is top regeneration priority for Rossendale?
- Valley Centre has highest impact for Rossendale.
- Asset value and purchase.
- Money borrowed for pool before groundwork done.
- Pool proposal had unexpected costs.
- Justifying spend when need to save 2.3 million over 3 years.
- There would be unacceptable level of risk.
- Need to improve and maintain provision.
- Need to invest in facilities which support themselves.
- KKP proposals can be applied to the existing pool.
- Work with the Leisure Trust to improve the offer.
- Put debate before members of the Council, need to hear all arguments before voting.
- People with children not able to come.
- Oppose diverting money to Valley Centre.
- No new pool will mean the Leisure Trust will struggle to keep within budget.
- If Valley Centre is a bargain price, why is no one buying?
- New pool would not be built with private money.

As the meeting had been in session for three hours the Mayor asked members to vote on whether the meeting would continue, as required by the Council's Constitution.

Resolved:

That the meeting would continue.

Members continued to discuss the following:

- New pool badly needed.
- Valley Centre figures don't stack up.
- Purchase mitigation none existent, no purchase price.
- Making assumptions with no protection.
- No clear viable developer.
- Does not include purchase of police station.
- Cost estimate of 1.5 million of there is a significant failure of pool.
- No details of negative impact on membership.
- Had four swimming pools twenty years ago.
- Not answered the question on keeping the pool open.
- Looking after all those representing and keeping facilities at the existing pool such as the sauna.
- Understand public frustration with mis-handling of pool project.
- Lots of facilities lost from the pool scheme that can't be supported financially.
- High streets are at the heart of every community, need to ensure they thrive.
- Regeneration of town centre is the single most viable option.
- All group leaders were in the meeting where arrangements were agreed.
- Disappointed regarding the condition of the pool.
- Glad there was a period of reflection, it has given chance to look at the pool, meet user groups, the Trust, speak to valley residents and attend the Rawtenstall Steering Group.
- Previously excluded from Steering Group.
- Pool project would have gone ahead if work had started before the elections.
- Rawtenstall is gateway to the valley.
- Not seen a business plan which stacks up for Valley Centre.
- True cost of the loan repayments.
- Retail landscape outstripped by the internet.
- Support for new pool not negotiable, reconfirm the commitment.
- Demolition costs vary, will be bottomless pit if not careful.
- Pools in other areas have grown since investment put in.
- Families with children and no transport would not be able to get to the new pool.
- People can get to the Valley Centre.
- Missed opportunity with Olympics.
- Pool could have promoted tourism.
- Chadderton model £3 million refurbishment.
- Edenfield is gateway to valley.
- We should support the promise we made.
- Children love to explore, there are hidden pools and lodges in the valley, it is important they learn to swim.
- Get the pool and sports facilities on one site.
- Why work on the pool was not started prior to the election?
- Valley Centre was allowed to become derelict.
- Purchase of Valley Centre is the only way to get the site in a tidy, useable state.
- Problem with the police station can be overcome.
- Look at Heywood example.
- Legal advisors working with Ashcap advised them not to demolish.

- Can't do both projects.
- Better chance of development if purchase Valley Centre.
- Rawtenstall can not sustain the level of retail required by the Valley Centre owners to make a 20% profit.
- Council need to take control.
- Who is coming to New Hall Hey?
- Valley Centre will not generate any money.
- Feasibility looked at but information on costs is commercially sensitive, it is not £2.5 million.
- In 2009 it was valued by Ashcap at at £6million.
- Would still need to subsidise new pool.
- Unfavourable ground conditions.
- Money borrowed before getting a quote, reckless gamble.
- Loss of facilities e.g. changing rooms and sanitary facilities.
- Huge pressures on commercial demand.
- Amendment is attempt to bring the Chamber together.
- Council has travelled a long way since it was the worst in the country. *
- Came onto Council to make services better.
- Council has reserves and officers who can rise to the challenge.

*At this point Cllr Essex had stated that it was a Labour Council. Cllr Aldred raised a Point of Order that it was a Conservative Council. The Mayor asked for evidence to be provided to the Director of Business who would check the position for the next meeting.

Councillor Essex recommended that the amendment be voted on.

A recorded vote was requested by Councillors Eaton, D.Smith and Serridge.

Voting took place on the amendment, the results of which were as follows:

Cllr Aldred	Against
Cllr A Barnes	Against
Cllr L Barnes	For
Cllr Cheetham	For
Cllr Crawforth	Against
Cllr Driver	For
Cllr Eaton	For
Cllr Essex	For
Cllr Evans	For
Cllr Farrington	Against
Cllr Gill	Against
Cllr Gledhill	For
Cllr Graham	For
Cllr Jackson	Against
Cllr Kenyon	Against

Cllr Lamb	Against
Cllr McInnes	Against
Cllr MacNae	Against
Cllr Marriott	Against
Cllr May	For
Cllr Milling	For
Cllr Morris	For
Cllr Neal	Against
Cllr Nuttall	Against
Cllr Oakes	Against
Cllr Roberts	Against
Cllr Robertson	Against
Cllr Sandiford	For
Cllr Serridge	Against
Cllr Shipley	For
Cllr D Smith	For
Cllr M Smith	Against
Cllr Steen	For
Cllr Wilkinson	Against
For	15
Against	19
Abstentions	0

The motion was lost, and the original recommendation was returned to.

A recorded vote was requested by Councillors Eaton, Wilkinson and Steen.

Voting took place on the original recommendation, the results of which were as follows:

Cllr Aldred	For
Cllr A Barnes	For
Cllr L Barnes	Against
Cllr Cheetham	Against
Cllr Crawforth	For
Cllr Driver	Against
Cllr Eaton	Against
Cllr Essex	Against
Cllr Evans	Against
Cllr Farrington	For
Cllr Gill	For
Cllr Gledhill	Against

Cllr Graham	Against
Cllr Jackson	For
Cllr Kenyon	For
Cllr Lamb	For
Cllr McInnes	For
Cllr MacNae	For
Cllr Marriott	For
Cllr May	Against
Cllr Milling	Against
Cllr Morris	Against
Cllr Neal	Against
Cllr Nuttall	For
Cllr Oakes	For
Cllr Roberts	For
Cllr Robertson	For
Cllr Sandiford	Against
Cllr Serridge	For
Cllr Shipley	Against
Cllr D Smith	Against
Cllr M Smith	For
Cllr Steen	Against
Cllr Wilkinson	For
For	18
Against	16
Abstentions	0

Resolved:

1. Council postpones the 2010 proposal for the redevelopment of a replacement swimming pool at Haslingden Sports Centre in favour of supporting the wider regeneration of Rossendale.
2. Council allocates up to £2.5m of Council resources in supporting the regeneration of Rossendale and in particular the acquisition, demolition and remediation of the Valley Centre into a useable and viable site. Council to authorise the Director of Business, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Regeneration and Finance & Resources, to enter into and conclude formal contractual arrangements.
3. Council and its officers to continue to work with and support Rossendale Leisure Trust in promoting leisure and health across Rossendale and maximise the use of our three leisure facilities managed by the Trust.

(The meeting started at 6.00pm and concluded at 10.50pm)