

Harrietsham Parish Council

Extraordinary Council Meeting Friday 8th April 2016

Cllr Ken stated that, as there would be public discussion at the end, if time allowed.

1. **Present:** Cllrs Kay (Chairman), Allardyce, Dean, Powell, Trussler and Williams, RFO M Cuerden
4 members of the public
2. **Apologies:** Cllrs Morris, J Sams, T Sams, C Roots and Mrs Broadhurst (Clerk)
3. **Disclosures and confidential items**
Changes to the Register of Interests
No changes to the Register of Interests were declared.
Declarations of Pecuniary Interests
No Declarations of Pecuniary Interests were declared.
Requests for Dispensation
No requests were submitted.
4. **Award of Amenity Contracts 2016-2018**

There then followed a lively 45-minute debate reviewing the awarding of the Amenities Contract.

In the end, there was a widespread feeling that the initial award, at the previous meeting, was un-sound as the criteria had not been properly applied. The Chair called for proposals, and Cllr Allardyce proposed that the previous decision be set aside, and that the Amenities Contract be awarded to Heber. This was seconded by Cllr Trussler with 4 in favour (Cllrs Allardyce, Kay, Trussler and Williams) with 2 against (Cllrs Dean and Powell).

Cllr Dean raised a concern regarding a complaint which has been received relating to the original awarding of the amenity contract. She queried how the complainant had been able to quote a section of the confidential amenity contractor tender document. Cllr Kay responded that this query had already been raised by the Parish Clerk and would form part of the investigation into the complaint.

Cllr Trussler suggested that the council should formally review whether or not a contract should be awarded to a company in which a Councillor has a direct interest, and asked that it be added to the next F&GP agenda. **ACTION: F&GP Cttee**

5. **Date of next meeting - Wednesday 27th April 2016 at 6.30pm, followed by the Annual Parish Meeting at 8.00pm, in the Ambrose Hall.**

With no further matters to discuss the meeting was closed at 8.12pm

Public discussion: There was a query as to how we arrived at stating that there would be an 80/20 split on the criteria in the first place. The Chair responded that it is a standard criteria which he had seen in many previous contracts, and so had "borrowed" it when drafting this one.