

Groups comments on Constitution

Council Meeting Procedures Rules

Section 4

Liberal Democrats	Conservatives
Executive 8 times a year Response: Support	4.2 Executive Meetings why only 8 meetings per year should be 12 unless no business to discuss Audit & Governance why no questions, motions allowed?
4.3.1 and 4.3.2 <i>The order of business shall be at the Chair's absolute discretion</i> Response: Accepted	
4.4 Members [] if they wish to speak <i>on an agenda item</i> Response: Support - Good change	
4.7.1(b) A maximum period of 30 5 minutes will be allowed with a maximum period of three minutes per questioner. The timing of questions will be one minute for a question, two minutes for a response and the same for supplementary questions Response: Accepted – but to be reviewed 12 months after implementation.	
	4.7.3 Questions requiring notice a) should be Council or Committee has powers or duties
4.7.1(c) Questions will be asked in the order that notice they were received. If all the questions cannot be taken those not dealt with shall automatically be referred to the next Ordinary Council meeting., except that The Chair of the relevant meeting may group together similar questions Response: We have seen questions to the council disrupted in the form of a denial-of-service attack, flooding the council with questions. Questions should not automatically carry over to the next meeting as this would disrupt timely and relevant questions submitted to the next meeting. Instead, surplus questions that are otherwise appropriate should receive a written response.	

<p>4.7.1(d) Questions must be about something the Council has responsibility for. Response: we would add “or affects the district”. This should be clear and consistent in just one place for public and Members questions. It still seems jumbled.</p> <p>4.7.1(e) days. Response: Support. We welcome clarity on the phrasing of notice periods and meeting days.</p> <p>4.7.1(f) or does not affect the District; Response: NO. We believe it is acceptable to ask about something that affects the district but may be outside the council’s direct control.</p> <p>4.7.1(f) Monitoring OfficerManaging Director Response: Accepted</p> <p>4.7.1(h) The responses will be published on the Councils web site the day before the relevant Council meeting Response: Accepted (but should it be the ‘working’ day before....</p>	
<p>4.7.3(b) which affects the District of Teignbridge Response: NO. We believe it is acceptable to ask about something that affects the district but may be outside the council’s direct control.</p> <p>4.7.3 and which falls within the terms of reference of that committee. The question should not be one relating to the daily running and procedures of the council which could have been asked of the relevant Chief Officer. Response: NO. This is a sweeping power and is inappropriate. Any question could have been asked of the relevant Chief Officer. If it was not answered, satisfactorily or at all, it is right that a Member can escalate it to Full Council or bring a question straight to Full Council if it is important.</p>	

<p>Members questions is an important form of engagement and scrutiny, both of which we need to improve as highlighted in the CLG report. Members questions need rules to make them workable and protected from disruption, but they are an important tool and should not be blocked or undermined.</p> <p>Members may ask a maximum of three questions per meeting and the timing of questions will be one minute for a question, two minutes for a response and the same for supplementary questions. The overall time limit for all member questions will be 30 minutes</p> <p>Response: Support – this will help protect members questions from disruption.</p>	
<p>4.9.3 Scope (a) Motions must be about matters that the Council is responsible for which are related to the responsibilities of the Council or which directly affect the District (and are not found on the meeting agenda).</p> <p>Response: No to Blocking questions that are on the agenda. Typically, a question with notice is researched and prepared in advance of the agenda. These questions should stand. Simplification of the language is accepted.</p>	
<p>4.9.5 Vote of No Confidence in the Leader 4.9.6 A Motion to remove the Leader of the Council</p> <p>We welcome clarification of this process. If such eventualities occur, it is better that a process is defined in the constitution. We considered if these two are a duplication, but concluded there are two distinct courses of action here, a successful no confidence vote does not automatically remove the Leader, it can</p>	<p>4.9.5 Last para, should include ‘ following an adjournment to allow Group discussions relating to this issue”</p>

be considered a “Shot across the bows” the strongest possible demand for a change of direction, but not requiring a change of Leader.

Conversely, a vote to remove the Leader is just that.

We also considered if there should be a minimum 5 months “per Leader” but concluded that a cooling off period after a change is defence against deliberately disruptive behaviour.

Response: Support – clarity in these processes is welcome.