STRATHERRICK & FOYERS COMMUNITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 27th August 2013 AT THE STRATHERRICK HALL, GORTHLECK

Present:

lain Brown (IBR) (Chair)
Liam MacNally (LM) & Catriona Fraser(CF)
Morag Cameron (MC) & Sally McGuire (SM)
Martin Donnelly (MDO)
Roz Rowell (RR)
Margaret Davidson (MDA)

Whitebridge, Gorthleck Glen Lia, Foyers Foyers Torness

Highland Councillor

1

Apologies – Ian Bateman (IB)

Agenda	AP	WHO
1. Forestry Commission.		
IBR stood down as chair due to a potential conflict of interest, session was chaired by CF.		
Julian Fryer Area Operations Manager and Doug Mitchell Inverness Ross and Skye Forest District Planning Managers explained they had taken on board the feedback from the last ward meeting, nearly 2 years ago, were keen to get input from the community on their plans and to keep		
the community informed as much as possible. The periodic review of the South Loch Ness Forest Design Plan is		
currently underway which is expected to last 18 months.		
They explained there has been an increase in tree diseases including in Scots Pine & Juniper. The public is asked to please keep an eye out and		
report any ill trees to the Forestry Commission.		
The Forestry have a long term plan to keep timber transport off the		
public roads by linking up as much of the forest blocks with roads on		
their land. They acknowledged this would take a number of years to		
achieve via a phased project, private forestry is also involved.		
£1.1m has been raised from the Strategic Timber Transport Fund and		
approximately a further £0.5m by Tec services, these are allocated to		
the B862 and B851 – There was some debate if the B852 was a marked		
timber haulage route or not FCS and Tecs will discuss. Concern was raised about the impact the timber lorries would have on		
the state of the road and whether it would be improved.		
Primarily due to disease and SSE works there will be up to trebling of		
timber extracted from the area over the next few years.		
The work for the SSE upgrade of the 225kv system in Inverfarigaig pass,		
is due to start in Spring 2014 approx. July. A guarantee was given that		
the road closure would not exceed 8 weeks and was planned at 6-8 wks		
Forestry agreed timber lorries would not pass local schools during		
school start and finish times or on Sundays. Also to wait until the roads		
had been gritted on the cold weather mornings.		

IBR to source a copy of the presentation and disease pictures for the community web site 2. Community transport. Shelia Fletcher thanked everybody for their returned surveys. The final survey report will be published by 23 rd of September. 3. Emergency Agenda Item – Trust CF wished to raise three points: 1. CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the prop	A further drop in session was proposed for 6 months time.	57	IBR
2. Community transport. Shelia Fletcher thanked everybody for their returned surveys. The final survey report will be published by 23 rd of September. 3. Emergency Agenda Item – Trust CF wished to raise three points: 1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier tha	· · ·	37	IDIX
2. Community transport. Shelia Fletcher thanked everybody for their returned surveys. The final survey report will be published by 23 rd of September. 3. Emergency Agenda Item – Trust CF wished to raise three points: 1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tabl			
Shelia Fletcher thanked everybody for their returned surveys. The final survey report will be published by 23 rd of September. 3. Emergency Agenda Item – Trust CF wished to raise three points: 1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal p	·		
3. Emergency Agenda Item – Trust CF wished to raise three points: 1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled	· •		
3. Emergency Agenda Item – Trust CF wished to raise three points: 1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tab			
CF wished to raise three points: 1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM — Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC — Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM — Only after being asked			
1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening,			
should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to pe	· ·		
expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM — Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC — Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM — Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR — Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR — Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF ques	1: CF raised the point that the community council as a whole		
meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM — Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC — Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM — Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR — Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR — Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB — Absent.MDO —	should apologise to SM and RR as perhaps it was unfair for them to be		
more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM — Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC — Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM — Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR — Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR — Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB — Absent.MDO — Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	expected to be voted to sit on the trust one night and to attend a trust		
was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item. MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	meeting the next. It was pointed out that they could have maybe had		
outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors. 2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	more time to read up on what was required. MC stated that an email		
2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	was sent to all new councillors soon after the election with a document		
2: Responsibility of the chair. CF raised the concern that as councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	outlining the job description and what was expected of trust directors.		
councillors we should make sure that we respect the rest of the community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
community and are respectful in how we deal with them. CF felt that during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
during the discussion (in regards to RR and SM first trust meeting) that the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	•		
the chair should have stopped the discussion after the accusations were made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	·		
made rather than allowing a protracted targeting of the trust directors. CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
CF felt it was unfair as there were no trust directors available to give their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM — Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC — Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM — Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR — Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR — Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB — Absent.MDO — Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
their side of events and that due to the serious terminology being used that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
that the incident should be discussed at a later date. 3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled, SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	_		
3: Procedural Discrepancies of Resolutions passed. CF stated her disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	· · · · · ·		
disappointment at the issues relating to the trust were raised as AOB and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
and felt that matters that were particularly serious should be a separate agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
agenda item.MD concurred that she had not come across such an important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
important and controversial issue being raised as AOB during her time as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	·	;	
as a Councillor. It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
It was pointed some members of the council seemed to be aware that LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
LM had a resolution to put forward but others were not and therefore were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
were not in a position to discuss the proposals properly as they hadn't had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	·		
had the opportunity to review the resolution and its effect on the trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	·		
trust's articles. CF asked each councillor if they had seen the resolution before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled , SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
before it was tables. LM – Yes his proposal put together several months whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled, SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
whilst previous council was sitting, MC – Yes was aware of the proposal but not that it would be tabled, SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	·		
but not that it would be tabled, SM – Only after being asked to print it earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
earlier that evening, RR – Knew of them but hadn't seen them. IBR – Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
Yes prior to petition meeting but unaware it was being brought up at meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
meeting. CF questioned this as IBR had copy of Trust articles with him. IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.	1		
IB – Absent.MDO – Unaware not at previous meeting.CF unaware.			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CF stated her disappointment at the perceived lack of openness of the		
CC pointing out that one of the reasons a new council was appointed	CC pointing out that one of the reasons a new council was appointed		
was due to perceived secrecy and private meetings of the old	was due to perceived secrecy and private meetings of the old		
Community council and we should be careful not to be seen to be doing	Community council and we should be careful not to be seen to be doing		
the same. CF also stated her disappointment at how the resolutions	the same. CF also stated her disappointment at how the resolutions		
were presented.	were presented.		

It was questioned whether all eight members of the CC acting as the sole member of the trust should have been fully aware of any intentions to change the articles or whether it was constitutionally okay for only some to be aware. – MD Pointed out it was contentious and was a potential legal mess. CF pointed out that under article 5.4 a motion or amendment which is contrary to a previous decision of the community council shall not be competent within six months of that decision. It was questioned that with the previous articles for the Trust being decided on the 26th August (within six months) that the motions couldn't be passed and that the articles could not be changed until after the 26th August. IBR stated he had been unaware that he could have stopped the discussion but has since been advised by CS that he could do so but that he felt he was following the correct procedure at the time and that of the training he has received over the years i.e. that once a motion is presented and seconded it has to go to a vote. MD advised that if she had still been present she would have suggested that it was continued at another meeting. MD pointed out that training could be provided to assist the councillors in their duties. MD asked whether it would be beneficial for either herself or CS to chair a meeting between the CC and Trust directors. It was agreed that it would be helpful.MD to advise date and time. A further discussion about the role of the trust took place IBR suggested that we put everything on hold until after the joint Trust CC meeting, the results of the Trust Survey were known and a possible further survey. CF asked if IBR could contact CS first thing in the morning to check whether the previous meetings decisions still stood in regards to Article 5.4. 4. Adoption of Minutes 20th August Minutes Proposed MC Seconded MCO and adopted. 5. AOCB IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent – agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let the			
presented and seconded it has to go to a vote. MD advised that if she had still been present she would have suggested that it was continued at another meeting. MD pointed out that training could be provided to assist the councillors in their duties. MD asked whether it would be beneficial for either herself or CS to chair a meeting between the CC and Trust directors. It was agreed that it would be helpful.MD to advise date and time. A further discussion about the role of the trust took place IBR suggested that we put everything on hold until after the joint Trust CC meeting, the results of the Trust Survey were known and a possible further survey. CF asked if IBR could contact CS first thing in the morning to check whether the previous meetings decisions still stood in regards to Article 5.4. 4. Adoption of Minutes 20 th August Minutes Proposed MC Seconded MCO and adopted. 5. AOCB IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent — agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let them know interviews will take place.IBR, LM AND SM TO INTERVIEW. 59 MC 60 IBR Fire report — Neil Kirkland gave a reminder of the heart start training event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September. Questions were raised about the Telford centre bus not picking up if less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.	sole member of the trust should have been fully aware of any intentions to change the articles or whether it was constitutionally okay for only some to be aware. – MD Pointed out it was contentious and was a potential legal mess. CF pointed out that under article 5.4 a motion or amendment which is contrary to a previous decision of the community council shall not be competent within six months of that decision. It was questioned that with the previous articles for the Trust being decided on the 26 th February and the amendments proposed on the 20 th August (within six months) that the motions couldn't be passed and that the articles could not be changed until after the 26 th August. IBR stated he had been unaware that he could have stopped the discussion but has since been advised by CS that he could do so but that he felt he was following the correct procedure at the time and that of		
that we put everything on hold until after the joint Trust CC meeting, the results of the Trust Survey were known and a possible further survey. CF asked if IBR could contact CS first thing in the morning to check whether the previous meetings decisions still stood in regards to Article 5.4. 4. Adoption of Minutes 20 th August Minutes Proposed MC Seconded MCO and adopted. 5. AOCB IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent – agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let them know interviews will take place.IBR, LM AND SM TO INTERVIEW. Fire report – Neil Kirkland gave a reminder of the heart start training event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September. Questions were raised about the Telford centre bus not picking up if less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.	presented and seconded it has to go to a vote. MD advised that if she had still been present she would have suggested that it was continued at another meeting. MD pointed out that training could be provided to assist the councillors in their duties. MD asked whether it would be beneficial for either herself or CS to chair a meeting between the CC and Trust directors. It was agreed that it would be helpful.MD to advise		
whether the previous meetings decisions still stood in regards to Article 5.4. 4. Adoption of Minutes 20 th August Minutes Proposed MC Seconded MCO and adopted. 5. AOCB IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent – agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let them know interviews will take place.IBR, LM AND SM TO INTERVIEW. Fire report – Neil Kirkland gave a reminder of the heart start training event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September. Questions were raised about the Telford centre bus not picking up if less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.	that we put everything on hold until after the joint Trust CC meeting, the results of the Trust Survey were known and a possible further		
5. AOCB IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent – agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let them know interviews will take place.IBR, LM AND SM TO INTERVIEW. Fire report – Neil Kirkland gave a reminder of the heart start training event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September. Questions were raised about the Telford centre bus not picking up if less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.	whether the previous meetings decisions still stood in regards to Article	58	IBR
IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent – agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let them know interviews will take place.IBR, LM AND SM TO INTERVIEW. Fire report – Neil Kirkland gave a reminder of the heart start training event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September. Questions were raised about the Telford centre bus not picking up if less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent – agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let them know interviews will take place.IBR, LM AND SM TO INTERVIEW. Fire report – Neil Kirkland gave a reminder of the heart start training event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September. Questions were raised about the Telford centre bus not picking up if less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.			
event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September. Questions were raised about the Telford centre bus not picking up if less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.	IBR realising the time suggested we dealt with only those matters that were urgent – agreed all round. MC to E MAIL Applicants for minute taker post to let them know		_
less than 4 people would be going over. MD will investigate.	event for 17 th September 3pm and 7pm Gorthleck Hall, he also the Offered and encouraged as many as possible to please take make use of a FREE Fire safety visit. Reminder of Ward forum 10 th September.		
	, , ,	61	MD