

## **Minutes of the meeting of Council held at Online meeting on Tuesday 27 April 2021 at 10.00 am**

**Present:** Councillor Sebastian Bowen (chairperson)  
Councillor Kema Guthrie (vice-chairperson)

**Councillors:** Graham Andrews, Paul Andrews, Polly Andrews, Jenny Bartlett, Chris Bartrum, Christy Bolderson, Dave Boulter, Ellie Chowns, Pauline Crockett, Gemma Davies, Barry Durkin, Toni Fagan, Elizabeth Foxton, Carole Gandy, John Hardwick, John Harrington, Liz Harvey, Jennie Hewitt, Kath Hey, David Hitchiner, Phillip Howells, Helen I'Anson, Terry James, Peter Jinman, Tony Johnson, Graham Jones, Mike Jones, Jim Kenyon, Jonathan Lester, Trish Marsh, Bob Matthews, Mark Millmore, Jeremy Milln, Felicity Norman, Roger Phillips, Tim Price, Paul Rone, Alan Seldon, Louis Stark, John Stone, David Summers, Elissa Swinglehurst, Paul Symonds, Kevin Tillett, Diana Toynbee, Ange Tyler, Yolande Watson and William Wilding

**Officers:** Interim Head of Legal Services, Democratic services manager, Interim DCS, Chief Executive and Acting Deputy Chief Executive – Solicitor to the Council, Acting Deputy Chief Executive – Chief Finance Officer, Assistant Director Children's Safeguarding Quality and Improvement, Lawyer 2 Advocate, Senior Solicitor, Senior Solicitor

### **56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tracey Bowes and Nigel Shaw.

### **57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **58. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC** (Appendix 1 – Public Questions – Pages 7 - 12)

A copy of the public questions and written answers, together with supplementary questions asked at the meeting and their answers, is attached to the Minutes at Appendix 1.

### **59. HIGH COURT JUDGEMENT RELATING TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES** (Appendix 2 – Member Voting Choices – Pages 13 - 16)

Council considered a report by the Acting Joint deputy Chief Executives and the Interim Director Children Services concerning the High Court judgement April 2021 relating to Children and Families.

The report and recommendations were proposed and introduced by the Leader. He apologised to the children and families failed by the actions of the local authority that had been the focus of the High Court judgement. He explained that there had been longstanding failures of leadership at the council that were being addressed with the appointment of a new Chief Executive and the appointment of an interim Director of

Children's Services. He referred to the Secretary of State appointment of a Department for Education (DFE) advisor and the requirement for cultural change at the council.

During the course of the debate the following points were raised:

- The findings of the judgement were shocking and upsetting and the council needed to restore faith in children's services;
- The role of all councillors as corporate parents and the need to insist upon improvement for the benefit of looked after children;
- The difficult working relationship with children's services and the need to change a culture of evasion and lack of transparency;
- An acknowledgement that there were excellent social workers in Herefordshire who needed help and support.
- Recommendations and learning from earlier judgements that had not been applied or implemented;
- The root-and-branch approach to achieve improvement and change were welcomed and the funding that would be required was acknowledged. It was hoped there would be assistance from local MPs to secure government support.
- The planned reviews needed to identify and highlight bad practice to facilitate cultural change;
- The role and accountability of cabinet members on the Council;
- The importance of scrutiny and the requirement for greater training of scrutiny members. The requirement for members of the children and young people scrutiny committee to be updated on current issues of significance. Councillors were provided with significant data regarding the performance of children's services but without fully understanding the detail;
- A culture existed across children's, legal and democratic services at the council to block access to information;
- The outcomes of the task and finish group in 2019 in response to the 2018 judgement and recommendations that had not been implemented;
- Elected members had felt that they were not listened to and should have been more forthright in raising concerns. Improvements were necessary to ensure that members were listened to;
- Longstanding issues had been identified in previous Ofsted judgements, over the previous 10 years, which included a lack of supervision of frontline staff and poor record keeping;
- The review of all cases in the system would be a long process that could take 3 – 5 years;
- The need for appropriate checks and balances to support social workers;
- Improvements to processes concerning the provision of legal advice in complex cases and work to improve the contact between legal and social workers;
- The role of Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) and the need to review the effectiveness of the service;
- The governance arrangement of the improvement board and how it would coordinate with scrutiny and the corporate parenting panel;
- The need to reconsider the functions and responsibilities of the corporate parenting panel;
- The importance of hearing the child's voice;
- There was concern regarding the late presentation of a significant number of documents to the court whilst the hearing was in progress;
- The importance of updating members through progress reports to meetings of the full Council to evidence commitment and improvement to external partners and stakeholders;
- The ongoing coroner's inquest and the potential criminal culpability of individuals in the judgement.

Councillor Felicity Norman seconded the recommendations in the report and explained that there was a focus on ensuring that the necessary changes would be undertaken. A number of actions were being progressed including the long term review of all current cases. Support had come from the local government association and partners and the new chief executive and interim director of children's services. It was important to listen, in particular to the voice of the child, and it was essential to rebuild trust. The mistakes and failures in the judgement were understood and they would be put right.

There was a brief adjournment at 12:34 p.m.; the meeting reconvened at 12:45 p.m.

#### Amendment 1

*To add recommendation (i):*

*Given the lack of firm recommendations for Councillors to approve for the next steps from here following the Family Court Judgment, we would like to propose that the Leader commissions a firm and clear action plan with action ownership and timescales to be presented to an extraordinary meeting of the Children and young people scrutiny committee to be held no later than 28<sup>th</sup> May 2021 for discussion and to make recommendations to full Council.*

Councillor Phillip Howells proposed the amendment above and explained that the inclusion of the additional recommendation would allow for more immediate implementation of improvements. The amendment would help provide clarity on the co-ordination and management of the planned improvements and detail of the timescales.

Councillor Roger Phillips seconded the amendment and explained that he supported it as a mechanism to keep the full Council updated.

During the course of the debate the following points were raised:

- The action plans that would emerge from the Improvement Board would be shared and advice from the DFE would be sought on the timescales;
- There was concern that the timescales in the amendment were not practicable.

Councillor Roger Phillips withdrew as the seconder of the amendment.

Councillor Terry James seconded the motion but requested an alteration to the wording to replace the words no later than 28<sup>th</sup> May 2021 with the words with urgency.

Councillor Phillip Howells as the proposer of the amendment agreed to the alteration above.

The debate continued and the following points were raised:

- The amendment would achieve an overarching plan that would co-ordinate a number of areas of work. It would assist all members understanding and provide updates to the children and young people scrutiny committee;
- There was concern that the amendment would delay the introduction of improvement initiatives;
- It was important that full Council retained an oversight of the progress of the improvements;
- The amendment would enable the children and young people scrutiny committee to see the next steps on the introduction of improvements and to provide comment;
- It was confirmed that the chairperson of the children and young people scrutiny committee would be a member of the Improvement Board.

The Leader, as the mover of the original report recommendations, explained that he was encouraged that the chairperson of the children and young people scrutiny committee would be a member of the Improvement Board and was content with the amendment as it would act as a useful prompt for updates to be provided to meetings of the full Council.

The amendment was put to the vote and was carried by a simple majority of Council.

**RESOLVED – That the following is added to the original report recommendations as recommendation (i):**

**Given the lack of firm recommendations for Councillors to approve for the next steps from here following the Family Court Judgment, we would like to propose that the Leader commissions a firm and clear action plan with action ownership and timescales to be presented to an extraordinary meeting of the Children and young people scrutiny committee to be held with urgency for discussion and to make recommendations to full Council.**

#### Amendment 2

*To add recommendation (j):*

*That all staff resigning from Herefordshire children's services are required to undertake an exit interview conducted by a children's social care specialist outside Herefordshire Council, to understand the reasons for their resignation. This process to be implemented no later than 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 with the outcome of all such exit interviews reported to the Children & Young People Scrutiny committee. This could be a stand-alone arrangement with an external consultant, or a reciprocal arrangement with another authority.*

Councillor Paul Symonds proposed the amendment and explained that he had confidence in the action plans and proposals for improvement in the report. The amendment was intended as a 'safety net' to alert the council to problems and issues reported by people leaving children's services.

Councillor Terry James seconded the amendment and explained concerns that departing employees felt constrained in exit interviews as to what they could say. Exit interviews should be an opportunity for outgoing staff to explain what was wrong with children's services.

During the course of the debate the following points were raised:

- There was support for the amendment;
- It was important that employees were heard and the conduct of exit interviews by an external person was supported;
- The exit interviews needed to be conducted face-to-face in preference to use of online facilities; and
- Officers should feel able to approach management at any time during their employment to outline concerns they might have.

The Leader, as the mover of the original report recommendations, explained that he understood that the exit interview would be for the benefit of management and any changes to the service resulting from the outcomes of the interview would be reported to the children and young people scrutiny committee.

The amendment was put to vote and was carried by a simple majority of the Council.

**RESOLVED – That the following is added to the original report recommendations as recommendation (j):**

**That all staff resigning from Herefordshire children's services are required to undertake an exit interview conducted by a children's social care specialist outside Herefordshire Council, to understand the reasons for their resignation. This process to be implemented no later than 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 with the outcome of all such exit interviews reported to the Children & Young People Scrutiny committee.**

**This could be a stand-alone arrangement with an external consultant, or a reciprocal arrangement with another authority.**

The Leader closed the debate and explained that this was a watershed moment for the Council. This was an opportunity to reinforce a new relationship between officers, members and the public. The family in the judgement had been let down with a number of lives affected and those children who had been failed would feel the impact throughout their lives.

The substantive recommendations, including those additional recommendations contained in the amendments carried above, were put to the vote and were carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED – That Council:**

- a) Notes the contents of the report;**
- b) Notes the Judgement set out in appendix 1 of the report;**
- c) Notes the Assurance and Improvement Strategy set out in appendix 2;**
- d) Agrees the establishment of an Improvement Board;**
- e) Approves the appointment of an Independent Chair for the Children and Families Improvement Board;**
- f) Notes the Secretary of State will approve the appointment of a DFE advisor to act as the Independent Chair of the Children and Families Improvement Board;**
- g) Approves the commission of External Reviews as determined necessary by the head of paid service;**
- h) Approves the Financial Provision to support the Review and Improvement Strategy, as set out in para 24 and appendix 3 of this report;**
- i) Given the lack of firm recommendations for Councillors to approve for the next steps from here following the Family Court Judgment, we would like to propose that the Leader commissions a firm and clear action plan with action ownership and timescales to be presented to an extraordinary meeting of the Children and young people scrutiny committee to be held with urgency for discussion and to make recommendations to full Council.**
- j) All staff resigning from Herefordshire childrens' services are required to undertake an exit interview conducted by a children's social care specialist outside Herefordshire Council, to understand the reasons for their resignation. This process to be implemented no later than 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 with the outcome of all such exit interviews reported to the Children & Young People Scrutiny committee.**

**This could be a stand-alone arrangement with an external consultant, or a reciprocal arrangement with another authority.**

The meeting ended at 1.51 pm

**Chairperson**

## Appendix 1 - Questions from members of the public

Question Number	Questioner	Question	Question to
PQ 1	Anonymous	How will social services investigate and correct other potential injustices that may have occurred over the past decade? In cases where legal aid is unobtainable families have likely been unable to question poor or unjust decisions made.	Cabinet member children and families
<p><b>Response:</b> We will be undertaking an external independent review of all open cases across children's services, including children in care, to assure ourselves that assessments and care plans are child focussed, are meeting the welfare needs of the child and that care plans are evidencing good safe care and parents are included and have a voice to the greatest extent possible. Citizen's Advice Bureau can provide free expert legal advice to anyone who feels a case has resulted in the wrong decision, which subsequently resulted in their being denied legal advice. We are committed to reviewing such cases on a case-by-case basis. And to support this, we have set up a dedicated email where you can submit 'cases of concern', the link of which is attached here: <a href="http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/careconcerns">www.herefordshire.gov.uk/careconcerns</a> or email <a href="mailto:careconcerns@herefordshire.gov.uk">careconcerns@herefordshire.gov.uk</a></p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b> Who will be undertaking the independent review, what are their competencies and will affected parties be advised of any errors, mistakes or poor practices, as well as their rights without having to contact Herefordshire Social Services/Herefordshire Council first?</p>			
<p><b>Response from Cabinet member children and families:</b> A written response would be provided.</p> <p><u>Written response provided on 12 May:</u></p> <p><i>There are a series of reviews that have been commissioned as follows:</i></p> <p>1) <i>We have created an independent assurance team that is specifically focussing on a review of practice and learning arising from this judgement. The team are comprised of experienced consultants who bring together a range of skills and expertise in the field of child protection, children in care and family care proceedings. As part of their work, this team are also reviewing and responding to members of the public who through our dedicated email for the public 'cases of concern', to help our ongoing learning. We remain committed to being transparent with members of the public, therefore if any errors or poor practice the independent team will contact individuals direct as indicated above.</i></p> <p>2) <i>The Director of Children's Services commissioned a forensic review around the quality of practice and leadership and management across the service, which is being undertaken by two highly experienced former HM Ofsted Inspectors, who now work with Council's who are on an improvement journey. The outcome and findings of this review will be shared with the independently chaired improvement board, and through the improvement plan, which the DfE advisor will maintain overview and scrutiny, that is reported to the Minister within the DfE on a six-weekly basis. This work commenced on the 12 April 2021.</i></p> <p>3) <i>We are in the process of commissioning an external audit review of all current open cases within the directorate, findings and any actions arising from these audits will be made shared with the Improvement board and identified within the improvement plan and any affected parties will be advised</i></p>			

PQ 2	Anonymous	To provide some public confidence, when and how will you ensure that false records on your mosaic system, doctors, health centers, hospitals, schools, and teachers in this case are corrected and updated and reflect truthful and objective information, especially facts that have been established in court?	Cabinet member children and families
<p><b>Response:</b> The Council's Access to Information team can be contacted to request access to personal records. Information can be found here: <a href="#">Access to information – Herefordshire Council</a>. If there is information that is incorrect then we as a council have a duty under UK General Data Protection Regulations (UK GDPR) to ensure that the records are updated and corrected; You can challenge the accuracy of personal data held about you by an organisation and ask for it to be corrected or deleted. This is known as the 'right to rectification'. If your data is incomplete, you can ask for the organisation to complete it by adding more details.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b> As it clear from the judgement, incorrect records with doctors were established as fact in court in this case. Have these been corrected since the judgement was served a month ago?</p>			
<p><b>Response from Cabinet member children and families:</b> A written response would be provided.</p> <p><u>Written response provided on 12 May:</u></p> <p><i>Children's and Legal services and relevant staff involved within the case are correcting any factual inaccuracies and will ensure these are shared with relevant agencies to ensure their records are updated. This work will be completed by June 12<sup>th</sup> 2021.</i></p>			
PQ 3	Anonymous	To provide some public confidence, when and how will all relevant professionals who have been given false information historically in this case, and who may interact with these children or Carers in the future, be made aware that false information had been given previously to them by the local authority?	Cabinet member children and families
<p><b>Response:</b> As part of our independent review of all cases, if incorrect information has been identified within records, this will be corrected in this case and others and disseminated to all professionals involved with the case to ensure their records are updated. As indicated in the previous question we as a council have a duty under GDPR to ensure that the records are updated and corrected; You can challenge the accuracy of personal data held about you by an organisation and ask for it to be corrected or deleted. This is known as the 'right to rectification'. If your data is incomplete, you can ask for the organisation to complete it by adding more details.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b> As it clear from the judgement, professionals, particularly doctors in 2014 and 2019, were given false information by the social worker / foster carer. Have these been corrected since the judgement was served a month ago?</p>			
<p><b>Response from Cabinet member children and families:</b></p>			



A written response would be provided.

Written response provided on 12 May:

*Children's and Legal services and relevant staff involved within the case are correcting any factual inaccuracies and will ensure these are shared with relevant agencies to ensure their records are updated. This work will be completed by June 12<sup>th</sup> 2021.*

PQ 4	Anonymous	It is evident from the judgment that the failure of these foster carers' acceptance of the 2013 judgement was a major factor of the long-standing failures. What specific immediate actions are you going to take with these foster carers, or any other carers, who do not follow court rulings?	Cabinet member children and families
------	-----------	---	--------------------------------------

**Response:**

Foster care is an incredibly difficult and challenging job, as many of these children have suffered significant trauma in their lives, which has left them with complex and challenging needs. As a council and corporate parent, we recognise and value the importance that our foster carers make every day to 'our' children's lives. The need to ensure our foster carers are supported and provided with additional resources and training as and when required is of the paramount importance.

We have been introducing new policies and procedures to support practice development in the fostering team since the 2018 High Court Judgements. This will continue as part of the improvement plan to address learning from this case. Training for foster carers, including the current carers is continuing and future training is planned to improve the service needs. All this work has been undertaken jointly with colleagues within Legal Services, so we can assure adherence with court rulings, and the improvement work which has been undertaken will be overseen by the independent improvement board.

In addition, in January 2021 we recruited a Fostering Independent Reviewing Officer (who is a qualified social worker) who is providing independent oversight of our foster carers to ensure their assessments are robust, they are provided with the right level of training and support, and that they adhere to established policy and procedures for looking after children in our care and this will include support to the current carers.

**Supplementary Question:**

Your legal department has been content for 8 years with the foster carers' non-acceptance of the 2013 judgement. Their entrenched views was highlighted in court in the court case 2015-2017. What specific training will continue and which one is planned for these foster carers and your legal team?

**Response from Cabinet member children and families:**

A written response would be provided.

Written response provided on 12 May:

*Like social work, being a foster carer is a difficult and challenging role, and as a Council we remain grateful for the valuable role they undertake in caring for children who are unable to live with their families. Providing good support and training to equip them to undertake this invaluable role is essential. There is a commitment to deliver specific training for all foster carers, including the carers within this judgement, which will be developed and delivered through the role of the fostering reviewing officer (FIRO), the Independent Assurance team, who are leading on the learning from this case, together with legal colleagues. This training will consider learning from the 2015-2017 and this more recent judgement.*

PQ 5	Anonymous	The Foster Care Providers and the independent review officer treated Court findings with contempt over many years and have harmed the children as a result, due in part of the very disturbing longstanding mindset that is evidently present at the council. Beside the direct actions to address the conduct of Social Workers and Carers, what immediate steps will you take to assure that there is a proper and independent functioning Foster Carer Review Panel and IRO department?	Cabinet member children and families
------	-----------	--	--------------------------------------

**Response:** The appointment of a Fostering Independent Reviewing Officer (FIRO), will ensure adherence to court decisions, consistency and balance in decision making and the role of the Foster Carers re- parental responsibility and the wishes and feelings of children and young people in our care. The FIRO will be chairing reviews with Foster Carers and will undertake audit work on the robustness of plans for looked after children placed in foster care. The post holder commenced in January 2021.

Concerning the IRO service, following a vacancy, a new experienced Head of Service has been appointed from a council judged by OFSTED to be 'outstanding'. They commenced their role in November 2020. Further work is underway on learning lessons from the review with a specific focus on independent support and challenge to social workers in terms of childcare planning and using the escalation policy to improve consistency of practice, and quality assuring and auditing of cases as part of the shared learning and improving practice

**Supplementary Question:**

What has the FIRO done in this case over the last 4 months?

**Response from Cabinet member children and families:**

A written response would be provided.

Written response provided on 12 May:

*The fostering independent reviewing officer (FIRO) is a new post that has been established. Their role is ensuring a quality assurance scrutiny of work within the team, but also around wider practice development on the importance and value, of a positive relationship between the birth family and foster carers. A significant part of this work, is being clear and consistent in the way we understand, recognise, and ensure parents' rights and voices in the care of their children is consistently applied. The FIRO has been clearly sighted on this case and the learning and is working closely with the independent assurance team who is leading on a review of this case.*

PQ 6	Mr J Roberts Lea Lawton	Many of the issues identified and some of the Council employees named in the High Court judgement of HH Justice Keehan were previously identified as a result of an earlier police investigation, circa 2017, which resulted in the conviction, at Worcester Crown Court, of a Social Care Manager from the same Looked After Children Team and is a matter of public record. Why was the culture in Children's Services not recognised and addressed effectively at this time when it was clearly evident?	Cabinet member children and families
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Although a number of changes in procedures, including the 'Abuse of Position of Trust (Sexual Offences Act 2013) a 'conflict of interest policy' and the Council's whistleblowing policy has been revised to include an anonymous procedure. It is clear that our previous commitments to improve our social care services for children have fallen sadly short of the standards expected.</p> <p>Looking forward, our newly recruited Principal Social Worker (PSW), who has come from an outstanding authority, will hold a critical role as a voice for social workers and has in place regular meetings with practitioners and managers to gain insight into some of the management issues highlighted in this and past judgements. Where a culture of mismanagement is identified, the PSW will be raising this with senior managers and the new Interim Director to ensure these are addressed accordingly.</p>			
PQ 7	Ms T Jeyasingham Ross on Wye	Why is the children's service structured so managerial top heavy?	Cabinet member children and families
<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Our senior management structure consists of three Assistant Directors, who each have reporting to them three heads of services, with front line team managers reporting to them. We do not consider that this is disproportionate for our social work. Having sufficient management oversight is key to providing robust oversight and critical reflection on the quality of support we provide to children and young people as well as to practitioners working to help them. Through our new Signs of Safety practice framework, we are working to improve how we foster a culture of learning and open reflection, as well as improving how we work with children and families in a strength based and relationship approach to avoid the difficulties highlighted in the judgement in future.</p>			
<p><b>Supplementary Question:</b> How does this structure reduce the experience of micro management and bullying within the service?</p>			
<p><b>Response from Cabinet member children and families:</b> A written response would be provided.</p> <p><u>Written response provided on 12 May:</u></p> <p><i>As indicated in my first response, the children's services management structure is less top heavy in comparison to most other local authorities. The importance of management oversight cannot and should not be underestimated, this not only ensures staff are supported in their thinking, decision</i></p>			

*making and judgement as social workers, but allows manager's to appropriately scrutinise the quality of assessments, care planning and decision making that has an impact on a child's future.*

*As part of our commitment to supporting our staff, we have trained individuals to take on Bullying & Harassment Advisor (B&HA) roles. B&HAs are colleagues who are trained to offer confidential information on issues relating to bullying and harassment.*

## Appendix 2 - Member Voting Choices

Report Generated:

27/04/21 14:11

Topic

Meeting ID

Council - Extraordinary Meeting

885 5385 7561

27-Apr-21

Amendment 1

User Name

Paul Rone

For

Sebastian Bowen

For

Yolande Watson

For

Mark Millmore

For

Carole Gandy

Against

Ellie Chowns

For

Barry Durkin

For

Jonathan Lester

For

Terry James

For

Dave Boulter

Against

Roger Phillips

For

Jim Kenyon

For

Christy Bolderson

For

Toni Fagan

For

Gemma Davies

Against

Polly Andrews

For

Phillip Howells

For

Michael Jones

For

Paul Symonds

For

John Hardwick

Against

Tony Johnson

Against

Kevin Tillett

For

Felicity Norman

Against

Louis Stark

For

Chris Bartrum

For

Jennie Hewitt

Against

David Summers

Against

Elizabeth Foxton

For

Kema Guthrie

For

Jeremy Milln

For

Pauline Crockett

Against

Kath Hey

Against

Tim Price

For

Peter Jinman

Against

William Wilding

Against

John Harrington

For

Trish Marsh

Against

Graham Jones

Against

David Hitchiner

For

Elissa Swinglehurst

Against

Bob Matthews

For

Ange Tyler

Against

Jenny Bartlett

For

Amendment 2	Helen I'Anson	For
	Liz Harvey	For
	Paul Andrews	For
	Graham Andrews	For
Amendment 2	Jonathan Lester	For
	Gemma Davies	For
	Yolande Watson	For
	Barry Durkin	For
	Mark Millmore	For
	David Hitchiner	For
	Jim Kenyon	For
	Jennie Hewitt	For
	Paul Symonds	For
	Jeremy Milln	For
	Louis Stark	For
	Michael Jones	For
	Ellie Chowns	For
	Terry James	For
	Polly Andrews	For
	Elizabeth Foxton	For
	David Summers	For
	Paul Rone	For
	Ange Tyler	For
	Tim Price	For
	Pauline Crockett	For
	Felicity Norman	For
	Kath Hey	For
	Graham Jones	For
	Elissa Swinglehurst	For
	Trish Marsh	Abstain
	John Harrington	For
	Carole Gandy	For
	John Hardwick	For
	Paul Andrews	For
	Kevin Tillet	For
	Christy Bolderson	For
	Toni Fagan	For
	William Wilding	For
	Kema Guthrie	For
	Phillip Howells	For
	Helen I'Anson	For
	Tony Johnson	For
	Bob Matthews	For
	Roger Phillips	For
	Chris Bartrum	For
	Jenny Bartlett	For
	Sebastian Bowen	For
	Peter Jinman	For
	Liz Harvey	For

## Substantive Recommendations

Paul Symonds	For
Louis Stark	For
Gemma Davies	For
Peter Jinman	For
Toni Fagan	For
Polly Andrews	For
Roger Phillips	For
Barry Durkin	For
David Hitchiner	For
Terry James	For
Ellie Chowns	For
Tim Price	For
Carole Gandy	For
Jeremy Milln	For
Jennie Hewitt	For
Paul Rone	For
Jim Kenyon	For
Tony Johnson	For
Christy Bolderson	For
John Hardwick	For
Elizabeth Foxton	For
Mark Millmore	For
Elissa Swinglehurst	For
Pauline Crockett	For
William Wilding	For
Helen I'Anson	For
Michael Jones	For
David Summers	For
Jonathan Lester	For
Felicity Norman	For
Kema Guthrie	For
Phillip Howells	For
Kath Hey	For
Ange Tyler	For
Bob Matthews	For
Graham Jones	For
Sebastian Bowen	For
Jenny Bartlett	For
Kevin Tillett	For
Chris Bartrum	For
Paul Andrews	For
John Harrington	For
Liz Harvey	For
Trish Marsh	For

