

11<sup>th</sup> May 2021

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on  
**Monday 10<sup>th</sup> May 2021**  
**At 7pm**  
**Via Zoom Link**

For the purpose of transacting the business as set out below.

**MINUTES**

	<p>Chairman's Welcome and introduction to the meeting. <b>The Chairman welcomed all and thanked for coming.</b></p> <p><b>He notified that the meeting was being recorded, requested all microphones be muted - unless asked to speak - and how ST would help identify those wishing to speak due to number of people present.</b></p> <p><b>He also explained there would be a public Forum for those who wished to make their views known, where he would invite people to speak one at a time.</b></p> <p><b>He informed how he had prepared a statement which he intended to paraphrase sections linked to the backing papers provided, which should hopefully help to cover everything being discussed tonight.</b></p>	
07/20	<p>Present:</p> <p><b>Cllr G Davison-Chairman (GAD)</b> <b>Cllr L Morgan – Vice Chairman (LM)</b> <b>Cllr S Agintas – (SA)</b> <b>Cllr A Anwar – (AA)</b> <b>Cllr P Kirkham – (PK)</b> <b>Cllr A Ronaldson – (AR)</b> <b>Cllr C Northwood – (CN)</b> <b>Cllr S Kennedy – (SK)-arrived-7.03pm</b></p> <p><b>Mrs K Fane – Minute-Taker</b> <b>Mrs S Tozer – Zoom Administrator</b></p> <p><b>33 Members of the public.</b></p>	
	<p><b>Cllr Kennedy joined the meeting at this point.</b></p>	

08/20	Apologies for absence: <b>Cllr M Millen-Agreed by 8 votes for.</b>	
09/20	<p>Public Forum for members of the public to speak:  <b>The Chairman invited DO to speak first to Council. DO asked the two following questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Who is the Councillor that made these allegations? Are you at liberty to say? GAD-Seeking advice. When I get answer, if allowed, I will email.</b></li> <li><b>2. The Councillor did not give the exact area the suspected contamination was. I take it no physical evidence? – If there had been, the area could've been sealed off with no need to shut allotment. Is Health &amp; Safety risk, putting other plot-holders at risk.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Chairman's Response: At this time, the Council is not able to disclose who the Cllr in question is.</b></p> <p><b>An informal meeting was held on Wednesday night (05.05.21) to discuss this. Council were not provided with the information they sought from the Cllr concerned. The Cllr in question was adamant the Council took immediate action and undertook testing and forced by certain mechanisms not at liberty to describe into taking action. Had to take a global position for the sake of health &amp; safety. Only option was to close site. Sincerely apologise as on Friday (07.05.21) we were told the locations.</b></p> <p><b>DO:</b>  <b>Feel Cllr needs to be made accountable and apologise to all plot-holders. Councillors need to seek that Councillor resigns as withholding information is unacceptable. All passionate about allotments. During pandemic, some plot-holders used as an escape. Very stressful and upsetting to collect plants when allowed.</b></p> <p><b>GAD:</b>  <b>I take on board what you have said but need to evaluate all the information related to this fully. When statement is read out, you will understand better where we are.</b></p> <p><b>Are you representing the body of plot-holders when asking for this Cllr to resign? Both DO and several other members of public responded 'yes'.</b></p> <p><b>S-Plot 25</b>  <b>Follow on from what DO-How passionate all are about the allotment-feels like a family/community. All been very</b></p>	

	<p>upsetting and distressing. Whatsap group trying to keep up moral.</p> <p>Just want to make a couple of points-You commented on 'sites' does this mean more than one site/plot affected?</p> <p>Also say a Cllr raised where the (alleged) contamination was, so was it a Cllr or by Cllr based on information from a plot-holder?</p> <p>GAD-One alleged sites-will describe later in Chairman's Remarks-site next to toilet block. Other don't know still-apparently near DO plot dug over by Ranger in summer 2020. The message from Cllr concerned-acting on behalf of 3<sup>rd</sup> party-not told plot-holder-raised issue and wishes to remain anonymous because of possible repercussions by plot-holders.</p> <p>S-P25-Questioned validity of what's been found if not concerned enough to come forward. Also raised 2020 but just now to plotholders.</p> <p>GAD-Accept what saying-Hope part of discussion between Cllrs tonight.</p> <p>ST-RA would like to speak:</p> <p>RA-Does anybody know what contamination actually is?</p> <p>GAD-Alleged contamination is supposedly asbestos – no evidence to support allegation.</p> <p>DJW&amp;DW-Have minutes of meeting held 27.06.18 where survey carried out near cesspit/toilet -says nothing there. Is that so, is there a report?</p> <p>GAD-Will cover in statement-were findings at the site at a particular location-but were such that could be and were dismissed. Will explain later.</p> <p>DJW&amp;DW-When most of allotment taken over by SPC from the Allotment Association was ploughed with tractor.</p> <p>GAD-That goes in our favour.</p> <p>DJW&amp;DW-Nothing there-was there when ploughed. Roughly two thirds (some occupied at time). Nothing came up at ploughing.</p> <p>GAD-thank BW for very important contribution. Will make Cllr aware of point made.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b>PB-Thank you for supplying background papers-read with interest. On basis of information very much hope Council will decide against any examination on the basis of evidence at the moment-the most important reason – in order to have contaminated land (by definition) must be significant possibility of harm caused. With Public Health England Factsheet says solid asbestos not significant risk. Should carry on using allotments as would normal but carry out normal hygiene procedures. If no risk, can't see why formal investigation should be instigated. Think also interesting to note in Tenancy Agreement, tenants required to remove hazardous materials such as asbestos, in safe/timely manner. Why if it is part of agreement all signed-are we getting in consultants to look at something which most councils realise is common thing to find on allotments? I hope this is the end of the matter and we can get back to using our plots. If have to give a waiver of responsibility sobeit. If have to have s separate warning, if have to change agreements-sure all happy to do. Please can we get back to something sensible when no significant risk of harm?</b></p> <p><b>J-Endorse all P said. Public Health England said about lead-benefits fresh air/exercise etc. outweigh any risk from contaminated land. In case of Bradwell Allotments, not proven. Plus, could be malicious/hoax.</b></p> <p><b>GAD-Thanked all for contributions, advised will be moving on to next part of agenda as much of what's being said is covered in the briefing note to the Cllrs. This is to give Cllrs background information needed to move through the rest of the agenda.</b></p>	
10/20	<p>Declarations of interest: <b>None.</b></p>	
11/20	<p><b>Chairman's Remarks: Background to the Allotment Closure. The Chairman confirmed had issued briefing note-Part C and was going to extract parts from it/paraphrase other parts. For full wording refer to Briefing Note Part C.</b></p> <p><b>At this point, DO added the plot dug over is not near his, but near 57A. GAD confirmed this will not be the only meeting Council have concerning matter.</b></p> <p><b>GAD returned to complete reading out Briefing Note Part C.</b></p>	

	<p>Staff were asked to write to all plot-holders to declare to us in their view were the plots contaminated or contained contaminate. We had 57 responses. 54 said no contaminants- which is 80% of the total number of plots. 1 response said their plot contained rubber from a carpet and another said they were not qualified to determine what a contaminate was. In terms of contaminates, it is clear the plot-holders are very aware there is no contaminate on your plots.</p> <p>To the Chairman's knowledge in the 40 years the site had been open, there have been no reports from any plot-holders of either minor or major health or injury at all from the inhalation of fumes or the ingestion of foreign matter, or dermal contact from contaminates. From Chairman's point of view there is no contaminates. The Chairman continued to explain to Council the use of the term 'contaminated' or 'potentially contaminated' was misleading. Implying 3 factors already in place.</p>	
12/20	<p>Council to approve the appointment of a site investigation company to undertake a general Phase I investigation specifically to examine fibrous materials. <b>The Chairman invited questions from Cllrs – some queried if it can be specific area/plot. Chairman responded up to Council. Several Cllrs agreed their wish to localise investigation.</b></p> <p><b>Following discussion, the Chairman asked Council for proposer (LM) and seconder (PK) to engage local person to do cursory review of as yet unidentified area.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed by 8 votes for.</b></p>	
13/20	<p>Council to approve the appointment of a consultant to act on matters arising from the investigative reports. <b>Following a discussion, the Chairman asked Council if they wished to change the wording to 'engage a person'. It was proposed by LM and Seconded by PK.</b></p> <p><b>Council to now engage a person to act on matters.</b></p> <p><b>The Chairman informed this item is now redundant due to decision made in item 12/20. He asked for Council to vote if agreed to discard.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed by 8 votes for to discard item 13/20, following 12/20 decision.</b></p>	
14/20	<p>Council to agree to liaise with BATs to determine the level of disruption caused by the closure and financial implications.</p>	

	<b>Agreed by 8 votes for.</b>	
15/20	<p>Pending the outcome of tonight's meeting, to recommend either continue to close the allotment site or reopen with immediate effect.  <b>The Chairman asked Council to vote on their choice.</b>  <b>Votes to continue to close site= 0</b>  <b>Votes to re-open immediately= 6 votes for, 2 abs</b></p> <p><b>The Chairman confirmed he we happy to open that night.</b></p>	
16/20	<p>a) <b>Vote to agree to hold a confidential Part 2 of the meeting at which press, and public will be excluded under the Public Bodies (Administration to Meetings) Act 1060 section (2).</b>  Agreed by 8 votes for.</p> <p>b) <b>Vote to allow a staff member/s to attend all or part of the confidential part 2 of the meeting.</b> No staff attended part 2.</p> <p><b>Part 1 Closed at 19.45pm</b></p>	
	<p><b>Confidential - Part 2</b>  Consideration of matters related to the following item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Staff matters-Minutes from this meeting are stored in a secure manner.</b></li> </ul>	