

SOUTH AYRSHIRE COUNCIL.

Minutes of a hybrid webcast meeting
on 6 November 2025 at 10.00 a.m.

Present in County Buildings: Councillors Iain Campbell (Provost), Laura Brennan-Whitefield, Ian Cavana, Alec Clark, Chris Cullen, Ian Davis, Brian Connolly, Julie Dettbarn; Martin Dowey, Stephen Ferry, William Grant, Wullie Hogg, Martin Kilbride, Mary Kilpatrick, Alan Lamont, Craig Mackay, Brian McGinley, Cameron Ramsay, Philip Saxton, Gavin Scott, Bob Shields, Duncan Townson and George Weir.

Present Remotely: Councillors Ian Cochrane, Hugh Hunter and Lee Lyons.

Apologies: Councillors Kenneth Bell and Bob Pollock.

Attending in County Buildings: C. Sneddon, Chief Executive; K. Braidwood, Depute Chief Executive and Director of Housing, Operations and Development; J. Bradley, Director of Communities and Transformation; T. Eltringham, Director of Health and Social Care; C. Caves, Chief Governance Officer; C. Cox, Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regulation; G. Hunter, Assistant Director – Communities; T. Simpson, Service Lead – Corporate Accounting; J. McClure, Committee Services Lead Officer; J. Chapman, Committee Services Officer; E. Moore, Clerical Assistant; and C. McCallum, Clerical Assistant.

Present Remotely: C. McGhee, Chief Internal Auditor.

1. **Provost.**

The Provost

- (1) welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedures for conducting this meeting and advised that this meeting would be broadcast live;
- (2) intimated that no apologies had been received; and
- (3) congratulated Councillor Wullie Hogg on his recent election and welcomed him to his first meeting of South Ayrshire Council.

2. **Sederunt and Declarations of Interest.**

The Chief Executive then called the roll and confirmed that there were no declarations of interest by Members of the Council in terms of Council Standing Order No. 17 and the Councillors' Code of Conduct.

3. **Presentation**

The Provost referred to the imminent retiral of Tim Eltringham, Director of Health and Social Care; outlined his significant contribution over the past eleven years since joining South Ayrshire in 2014 and during his long, successful career; noted that he would be sorely missed and presented Tim with a token of the Council's appreciation.

4. Minutes of previous meetings

(1) Minutes of Previous Meeting of the Council.

Provost Iain Campbell, seconded by Councillor Mary Kilpatrick, moved the Minutes of South Ayrshire Council of 23 September 2025 as a correct record.

The Council

Decided: to approve the Minutes of 23 September 2025 and authorise these minutes to be signed as a correct record.

(2) Minutes of previous meetings of Panels.

- (i) Appeals Panel of [23 October 2024](#).
- (ii) Audit and Governance Panel of [3 September 2025](#)
- (iii) Cabinet of [26 August 2025](#) and [23 September 2025](#).
- (iv) Chief Officers Appointments/Appraisal Panel of [23 June 2025](#).
- (v) Regulatory Panel – Licensing of [28 August 2025](#) and [25 September 2025](#).
- (vi) Regulatory Panel – Planning of [11 September 2025](#).
- (vii) Service and Partnerships Performance Panel of [20 August 2025](#) and [16 September 2025](#)

5. Results of Local Government By-Election 2025 – Ward 3: Ayr North

There was submitted a report ([issued](#)) of 21 October 2025 by the Chief Executive advising of the outcome of the recent By-Election in Ward 3 - Ayr North.

The Chief Executive introduced the report.

The Council

Decided: to note the outcome of the By-Election for Ward 3 – Ayr North and the election of Wullie Hogg as Councillor for this electoral ward.

6. Appointment of Chief Officers

There was submitted a report ([issued](#)) of 21 October 2025 by the Chief Executive updating Members in relation to the recent recruitment exercise for Chief Officer vacancies

The Chief Executive introduced the report and advised that the new Chief Executive, Stephen Penman, would commence employment on 17 November 2025; that he would leave his employment on 30 November 2025 following a short handover; and that the Chief Officers' Appointments/Appraisal Panel had agreed that, for future Chief Officer appointments, the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE) should be utilised to deliver the assessment centre component of the selection process.

The Council

Decided: to note the contents of the report.

7. Political Composition and Appointments to Panel.

There was submitted a report ([issued](#)) of 30 October 2025 by the Chief Governance Officer advising of changes to the political composition of the Council notified to officers; and seeking approval to make alterations to the composition of Panels and representatives thereon.

The Chief Governance Officer introduced the report and advised that the report outlined the resignations from Panels at paragraph 4.1 and provided detail of the changes to the Council's political composition following movements between parties; and that following recent discussions between the Leader and the various Group Leaders and Independent Members, a Motion (tabled) had been submitted as follows, moved by Councillor Brian Connolly and seconded by Councillor Alec Clark:

"that the Council

- (1) note the resignation of Councillors Alan Lamont and Mary Kilpatrick from the Audit and Governance Panel;
- (2) note the changes to the political composition of the Council notified to officers as of 22 October 2025 as set out in the report;
- (3) having taken account of the current membership of Panels and the 22 October 2025 composition based on proportionality (outlined in [Appendix 1](#) to the report), approve the following changes to the membership of Panels:-
 - (a) Audit and Governance – appoint Councillor Hogg as the Independent member and note the Conservative Party were to confirm their nomination for the Conservative member for noting at the next Council meeting;
 - (b) Regulatory Panel – note that Councillor Lyons, as the third Conservative member be removed from the Regulatory Panel and in his stead appoint Councillor Hogg as the Independent member and appoints Councillor Weir as an SNP member to the vacant position;
 - (c) Local Review Body – note that Councillor Lyons as the third Conservative member be removed from the Body and in his stead appoint Councillor Hogg as the Independent member and appoint Councillor Weir as an SNP member to the vacant position;
 - (d) Licensing Board – notes there was no change to the existing Board membership;
 - (e) Service and Partnerships Performance Panel – notes there was no change to the existing Panel membership;
 - (f) Appeals Panel – note the removal of Councillor Scott as the Independent member and the appointment of Councillor Dowey as the Conservative member to the Panel; and
 - (g) Ayrshire Shared Services Joint Committee - notes there was no change to the existing panel membership;
- (4) notes the substitution of Councillor Dowey for Councillor Bell on the Chief Officers Appointments/Appraisal Panel and delegate to the Chief Executive to seek nominations for the appointment of substitute members of the Chief Officers' Appointments/Appraisal Panel for each party and one from the Independents; and

- (5) request that officers make the required amendments to the composition of Panels to reflect these changes.

By way of Amendment, Councillor Brian McGinley, seconded by Councillor Philip Saxton moved that this matter be continued to the next meeting of South Ayrshire Council to allow further discussions to take place.

Questions were raised and comments made by Members in relation to:

- (i) there being a fundamental flaw in the logic of the report as the Independent Members were not a political group, therefore the proportionality argument did not follow; and that sufficient information had not been provided to allow a decision to be made on this report;
- (ii) concerns regarding proportionality as the Independent Members were eleven individuals and not a Group; and that more work was required on this matter before a decision could be made;
- (iii) that Members were elected as individuals or as a Member of a political party and that, despite various moves within parties, the Council was still largely representative of those who had voted, however, the report referred to a Member who had applied to join a political party which may not sit comfortably with many of the voting public; was it appropriate to declare this when he had not been accepted to the party when the report had been written; and was he now a member of that party; and the Chief Governance Officer advised that the report advised of his intention to join the Party, therefore it was competent to provide this information to Members; that it had been expected that a decision would be known, however, the Member remained an Independent at this time; and that he currently remained within the proportionality numbers as a Group was only established when it met the numbers required;
- (iv) that this matter had been addressed in a pragmatic and fair manner with many discussions taking place, therefore, consideration of this matter should proceed; and
- (v) the Conservative Member on the Audit and Governance Panel; and Councillor Dowey advised that currently Councillor Bell was a member of this Panel.

Following a question from Provost on whether he wished to proceed with his Motion, Councillor Connolly advised that he had had discussions with all political groups and the various Independent Members and that all Members had been in agreement with the proposals, therefore, he saw no reason to defer this matter.

Following comments made by Councillor Saxton, he apologised for any offence caused and Councillor Dowey accepted his apology

Eleven Members voted for the Amendment and fifteen for the Motion, which was accordingly declared carried and the Council

Decided: to approve the Motion as outlined at (1) to (5) above.

8. Scheme of Delegation.

There was submitted a report ([issued](#)) of 29 October 2025 by the Chief Governance Officer seeking approval to amend the Scheme of Delegation following review.

The Chief Governance Officer introduced the report.

Councillor Brian Connolly, seconded by Councillor Alec Clark, moved the recommendations as outlined in the report.

Questions were raised and comments made by Members in relation to:

- (1) the functions of the Ayrshire Shared Services Joint Committee (ASSJC) where it was stated that the Ayrshire and Arran Tourism Team "manage and oversee the delivery of tourism activities that are agreed by the three Ayrshire Councils (East, North and South) to be shared from time to time"; and the Chief Executive advised that the key phrase was "from time to time"; that the Terms of Reference had been drafted around eleven years ago and were now out-of-date; that tourism work was carried out by this Council without the arrangement of a shared service but this function was still in the Terms of Reference; that a recent report to Cabinet had outlined that colleagues at East Ayrshire Council who had drafted the original Terms of Reference were now undertaking a review of these to bring back to the ASSJC for approval so that they were broader in scope; that this would give future provision for proposals to go through the ASSJC and then to this Council for agreement before anything was enacted;
- (2) 4.1.3 "powers delegated to the Director of Education, to accept and administer any new Trusts and small endowments for schools, to be amended to also include other bequests, up to a value of £25,000 (ED05 refers)", does the accepting of bequests by the Director of Education up to this level on behalf of the Council comply with Trust Law and the Chief Governance Officer advised that they could; and
- (3) 4.1.3 and how did Members get appraised of the decisions made by the Director under this delegated power; and the Chief Governance Officer advised that the accepting of larger donations sat with members ; and that Members would be notified of any exercise of the delegated power by a report most likely for noting at Cabinet.

The Council

Decided: to approve the revised Scheme of Delegation (attached as Appendix 1 to the report) with effect from 7 November 2025.

9. 2026-27 Budget Strategy and Budget Update

There was submitted a report ([issued](#)) of 28 October 2025 by the Chief Financial Officer to agree a revised Budget Strategy for 2026-27 and update the indicative 2026-27 budget based on the latest available information and recent actions taken; and seeking approval of Resource Pressures for inclusion in the 2026-27 budget.

The Service Lead – Corporate Accounting introduced the report and advised of the three-stage budget strategy for 2026/27 as outlined in paragraph 4.1 of the report; advised of the updates on various factors that would impact on the revised 2026/27 indicative budget position, including explanations of various actions taken by officers in recent weeks in preparing for the forthcoming budget, as outlined in paragraph 4.3; referred to the budget briefing which had provided members with the background to changes and the subsequent actions taken; outlined that paragraph 4.4 of the report sought approval of various Resource Pressures uplifts for 2026/27 totalling £3.24m covering a range of contractual arrangements and also advised of the intention to present a report to Council in December 2025 seeking approval of uplifts to various fees and charges across a number of service areas; outlined that, based on the various changes to contributing factors outlined in paragraph 4.3 and the request for resource pressure uplifts in paragraph 4.4, the revised indicative budget sat at £15.399m (after removing the assumed Council Tax uplift of 8%) which was an improvement from the indicative budget position of February 2025 of £17.302m; advised that paragraph 4.7 contained a range of Council Tax uplift scenarios intended to highlight the potential scale of the remaining budget gap after applying each of those options, with the size of the gap dependent upon the level of Council Tax increase agreed which would be a matter for Members to determine at the Budget meeting of the Council; and that the revised budget gap was based on a reassessment of many contributing factors and that the risks associated with the underlying budget assumptions were outlined in paragraph 4.10.

Councillor Iain Davis, seconded by Councillor Brian Connolly, moved the recommendations as outlined in the report.

Questions were raised and comments made by Members in relation to:

- (1) there having been a considerable amount of work carried out around the 2026/27 budget and thanking officers for assisting with this process; that most of this report updated on the current position, however there were two areas to be decided on, the budget strategy where the timeline being followed was partly dictated by when the budget settlements were received by the Council; and around resource pressures where most were contractual, however, the one that was not was the increase in cyber security resources and that, given recent events in the public and private sectors, this was a sensible measure to take;
- (2) that the current financial environment was very unstable with the only constant being that the Council required to make savings; that the Council was in a very difficult position in terms of balancing the books and that there came a point when the amount of money available did not match what the Council was obliged to deliver and there required to be discussions with COSLA and the Scottish Government regarding the future of local government; that the Council was taking a pro-active approach but there were differences of opinion on where monies should be saved from; that previous savings were obviously not adequate; that there were lots of unknowns within the report that required to be dealt with as they occurred; and that Members required to work together to bring together a balanced budget; and
- (3) that additional monies were required from the Scottish Government to allow local authorities to provide services and meet demands; and seeking clarification from Councillor Davis on pension contributions, as the Council's representative on the Strathclyde Pension Fund Board, who advised that there had been no change to date, therefore, the estimates were the base the Council required to use; that the pension fund was a triennial valuation which was due to be evaluated next year, therefore, it would be some time before the actual rate was known, however, he would continue to update all senior officers of any developments.

The Council

Decided:

- (a) to approve the revised Budget Strategy for 2026-27 as outlined in paragraph 4.1;
- (b) to note the various updates to the 2026-27 contributing budget factors as outlined in paragraph 4.3;
- (c) to approve the various Resource Pressure requests detailed in Appendix 2;
- (d) to note that various proposed fees and charges uplifts would be submitted to Council in December 2025 for consideration and approval;
- (e) to note the revised estimated budget gap for 2026-27 of £15.339m, prior to the application of any Council Tax uplift as stated in paragraph 4.6; and
- (f) to note the high degree of risk and uncertainty that remained with many of the assumptions being made as outlined in paragraph 4.10.

10. Pride in Place (PiP) Funding.

There was submitted a report ([issued](#)) of 29 October 2025 by the Director of Transformation and Communities updating the Council on a recent announcement from the UK Government regarding the allocation of Pride in Place (PiP) funding and recommending the establishment of an independently chaired "Pride in Place" Neighbourhood Board once detailed guidance was received from the UK Government to oversee the new fund, with the Board's purpose being to direct investment from the £20 million Pride in Place Fund, ensuring effective and transparent delivery of projects.

The Assistant Director - Communities introduced the report and advised that an announcement had been made in recent weeks by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) that the funding be allocated to South Ayrshire and that senior officers had met to discuss where within a limited number of qualifying datazones the funding should be allocated to and had been responding at pace to draft Terms of Reference for the Board, to establish who would sit on the Board and drafting a document to be submitted to the UK Government by 14 November 2025 to consider where best to allocate the funding.

Councillor Brian Connolly, seconded by Councillor Bob Shields, moved the recommendations as outlined in the report.

Questions were raised and comments made by Members in relation to:

- (1) whether officers could demonstrate that the Pride in Place funding was actively distributed across the wards of Ayr and associated economic groups and if the funded projects would show commercial and community benefits; and the Assistant Director – Communities advised that the Neighbourhood Board was currently being established along with the Terms of Reference and governance arrangements for this Board and that the guidance on Pride in Place outlined that it must relate back into Council strategies; that officers would advise where the key opportunities were; and that it would be for the Board to decide, once established, where the money was best utilised;

- (2) whether any funding would be allocated to Troon and Prestwick; and the Chief Executive advised that, at this time, full guidance was still awaited; that there were six qualifying intermediate zone areas in South Ayrshire that were not part of Phase 1 programme and that it was those zones that triggered the £20m allocated, with the Council being asked to identify an area for interventions for a single contiguous area, although some of the benefits could come in town centre locations outwith these zones; that there were currently two qualifying intermediate zones which abut each other that relate to Ayr town centre, however, discussions were required with the UK Government on these zones; that the Council would also work closely with Elaine Stewart, the MP for this area regarding this; that all decisions of the Board must comply with the UK Government's criteria; and that, once more information was known, a further report would be submitted to Council;
- (3) requesting that a Youth Board be established to work alongside the Town Board to seek the views of young people from Ayr; and the Chief Executive advised that a proposed representative on the Board was a Head Teacher who would be the conduit into the education sector;
- (4) welcoming this funding; and outlining the importance of a wide consultation;
- (5) seeking assurances that other South Ayrshire towns and villages had not been forgotten in terms of South Ayrshire allocation of funding; and asking who the decision body was; and the Chief Executive advised that the UK Government was the funding body who had set the criteria by use of a community needs index which, blended with the Scottish Indices of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) funding, produced priority data zones; that this was phase 2 of a longer term programme and was replacement funding for what was previously European Structural funds; and that, whilst this funding was welcomed, had it been granted without criteria, there would have been more flexibility to direct it to where it was most required;
- (6) as the £2m per year seemed very rigid and there would be a variation over the course of the ten years in terms of both capital and revenue spend, did the guidance cover this or would the Council be in a position to negotiate with the UK Government to have flexibility on utilising the funding; and the Assistant Director – Communities advised that the guidance was that this was a relatively flat allocation; that this was part of a range of funding which would form a rolling programme; and that this funding must fit with the Council's existing strategies and policies which would be a guide to the Board as to ascertaining where best to allocate the monies;
- (7) paragraph 2.1 (vii) of the report and if the update report would be submitted to Council; and the Chief Executive advised that, as matters were moving so quickly a number of reports would require to be considered and that ideally, something of this importance should be submitted to Council, however, due to the pace of this issue, many items within the report would be reported retrospectively; and that this matter could be delegated to Cabinet or to Audit and Governance Panel for scrutiny, however, presently due to there being no guidance, this was being pieced together using information from other Local Authorities who had been part of Phase 1 of the process;
- (8) if non-political Board members would be asked to commit for the full ten year life of the Board as it was important to have consistency; and the Chief Executive advised that the members of the Board would be those whose business life or community life was in the area and a local Head Teacher had been asked to represent education on the Board, however, it was not realistic to ask people to commit for a ten year period;

- (9) whilst welcoming this good initiative, was there a commitment that the funding would continue for the ten year period; and the Assistant Director – Communities advised that all correspondence from the UK Government was around the ten year timeline and that commitment would be legally ratified, however, going forward there could be changes to the political arrangements;
- (10) whether there was leeway to carry monies over from the first year; and the Assistant Director – Communities advised that there was a recognition that, although the Council would want to commit funds in-year, this initiative was moving at pace and he had liaised with colleagues around the commitment of these projects and the ability to carry them forward and they could be carried forward, notwithstanding any agreement on paper; and
- (11) thanking officers for their work on this exciting project; noting that the Board was non-political with members who had a lot of talent and enthusiasm for Ayr North and the Town Centre.

The Council

Decided:

- (a) to note the contents of the UK Government's Pride in Place funding and in particular, the allocation of £20 million for Ayr over ten years;
- (b) to delegate to the Chief Executive to make such necessary arrangements via engagement with the Council Leader and the local MP to secure the appointment of the Town Board independent Chair as a matter of urgency;
- (c) to delegate to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Council Leader to make such arrangements as necessary to arrange nominations for membership for the inaugural meeting of the Town Board including two elected members and two further elected members as substitutes;
- (d) to delegate to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Council Leader to support the Town Board to prepare a Regeneration Plan for submission to the UK Government by midday on 14 November for ratification by 28 November 2025;
- (e) to note that the Council would provide support to the Town Board and act as Secretariat and that the Council be designated as the Accountable Body for the administration of these funds; and
- (f) to note that a further update Report would be provided outlining the progress of the creation of the Town Board and subsequent information submitted to UK Government.

Adjournment

The time being 11.10 a.m., the Council adjourned.

Resumption of Meeting

The Council resumed at 11.25 a.m.

11. Redevelopment of the Former Hourstons Building and Former Arran Mall, Ayr

There was submitted a joint report ([issued](#)) of 24 October 2025 by the Depute Chief Executive and Director of Housing, Operations and Development and Director of Health and Social Care Partnership seeking approval to discontinue the proposed Care Village project and to develop alternative proposals for residential development on the former Hourstons and Arran Mall sites.

The Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regulation introduced the report and advised that, following a decision taken at Cabinet, discussions had taken place with South Ayrshire Health and Social Care Partnership and NHS Ayrshire and Arran (NHSAA); provided an update on progress since that decision had been made; outlined the recommendations; and advised that a further report would be submitted to Council in March 2026.

Councillor Martin Kilbride, seconded by Councillor Bob Shields, moved the recommendations as outlined in the report.

Questions were raised and comments made by Members in relation to:

- (1) the commitment of NHSAA; and the Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regulation advised that NHSAA had been involved in discussions and were committed in principle to examining the proposed development and were supportive of it, caveated with the costs involved being acceptable;
- (2) the demolition costs; and the Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regulation advised that this was a recent costing and was as reliable as could be presented;
- (3) discussions taking place with officers from the NHSAA when they had stated that they had no available resources to contribute to this project; and that the proposals were not affordable;
- (4) the costs to the public to get to this point; and the Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regulation advised that there were a number of costs involved, with the majority of these costs being acquisition costs; and that to date the costs involved were mostly acquisition costs and the other costs made up of asbestos removal, survey costs and demolition costs. The Chief Executive further advised that there had been a recent request regarding specific design works related to this proposal; that the figure had been calculated by Technical Services and he would obtain this figure and circulate it to Members; but that the costs incurred were in the main required for the further development of the site and needed for its development for residential housing..;
- (5) that this project had not been a viable option as the Health Board did not have the funds; and that, in terms of due diligence and best value, it was important that the Council was open and transparent with the public the Member advised that he wanted officers to ensure that the options appraisal for the residential housing development was carried out in its entirety;

- (6) seeking assurances the sites were secure as there had been reports of intrusions; and the Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regulation advised that, following reports of intrusions, the sites had been immediately inspected by the Council's Team and that, in most instances, there had been no evidence of intrusions; and that she was satisfied that the team had done everything possible to ensure the security of Arran Mall and the Hourstons development;
- (7) the specific redevelopment options on the table; the deadline for the options appraisal; how quickly demolition and construction could begin; and if any potential development partners had expressed an interest; and the Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regulation advised that there were a whole range of options open to the Council; that a substantial amount of work had been carried out which had enabled the statutory consents to be in place to allow demolition to proceed which was expected to be in Spring 2026; that there was a great deal of work involved in reaching the point of being able to demolish a building; and that engagement with potential housing associations was an option that would be examined between now and March 2026 before officers make recommendations to Council;
- (8) that this project had been discontinued for good reason; that Arran Mall was still in situ because the Council could not get clear title of this building when proposing to build the leisure centre; that, had the leisure centre gone ahead it would have bankrupted the Council; and that erecting housing in this site was the best option;
- (9) that, had the plans for the leisure centre progressed, it would have been affordable and would not have bankrupted the Council;
- (10) whether the previous statements about the delay being caused due to the difficulties getting clear title was correct; and the Chief Governance Officer advised that she would confirm the position in writing to Members following this meeting;
- (11) the frustration that the site was still sitting empty; that it was unfortunate that the plans could not go ahead; and that it was hoped that the plans coming to Council in March 2026 could be delivered quickly;
- (12) that a resolution was required soon, and it was hoped if the housing development progressed that there was a substantial amount of social housing included; and
- (13) that it was disappointing to note that NHSAA were not progressing with this as it would have been a fantastic project for the people of South Ayrshire; commending officers for the work carried out to date; and outlining that this now provided the Council with an opportunity to provide something meaningful in the Town Centre.

The Council

Decided:

- (a) to note that NHS Ayrshire and Arran (NHSAA) had advised that they were unable to provide any significant funding for the Care Village project and that they could not commit to any involvement in the project for the foreseeable future;
- (b) to agree that the Council discontinue the Care Village project and that officers explore options for a mixed tenure residential development on the Hourstons and Arran Mall sites;

- (c) to request that officers present a report to Council by March 2026, with an options appraisal detailing the different forms and tenure of residential development for the Hourstons and Arran Mall sites, the option of disposal of the sites on the open market and/or the engaging with a development partner;
- (d) to agree that officers proceed with procurement of a contract for works to include the demolition of the Hourstons building and retention of key façades, with capital allocation for the works from the remaining Hourstons budget; and
- (e) to request the Depute Chief Executive and Director of Housing, Operations and Development to arrange the procurement of an advanced works contract for removal of potential bat roosting sites prior to the start of the roosting season and thereafter the execution of the necessary contract documentation for the works described in recommendation 2.1.4, subject to approval of a Demolition Warrant.

12. **Notice of Motion**

In accordance with Council Standing Order No. 18, a Notice of Motion was submitted by Councillor Bob Shields and seconded by Councillor George Weir, as follows:

"As Members will be aware, in recent years, as a Ward Councillor, have received a considerable number of complaints from residents of the flats in the Ayr Harbour area who live in single entry flatted dwellings about the impact of Short Term Lets on their community. These complaints reference noise, litter, parking issues, and anti-social behaviour

Consequently, I am requesting that Council supports this Motion that the Chief Executive requests relevant officers in the Planning Service and Short Term Lets Licensing Team to bring forward a joint report to Council within 6 months of today's date that provides details of any options for policies which could be considered by Council to address the issues raised by these residents. The report would include and address the option for the development of any appropriate planning guidance, and/or the steps that would require to be taken by planning officers for the creation of designated short term control area(s)."

On moving his Motion, Councillor Shields advised that he wished to add the words "and other South Ayrshire " in the second paragraph of the Motion, following the words "raised by these".

A full debate took place regarding the terms of the Motion and questions were raised which were responded to by the Assistant Director – Planning, Regulation and Development and the Chief Governance Officer.

The Council

Decided: to agree the Notice of Motion as outlined on the agenda with the addition of the words "and other South Ayrshire".

13. **Formal Questions.**

In terms of Council Standing Order No. 26.2, there was submitted a [Formal Question](#) from Councillor Craig Mackay.

Councillor Mackay raised a supplementary question as follows: "do we have a remit in raising awareness of a heritage location, as opposed to the purely planning based response?"; and the Depute Chief Executive and Director of Housing, Operations and Development advised that the Council had a responsibility to raise awareness of matters that provide a heritage element to society and that appropriate advice would be provided in terms of Planning, Building Standards and listed building in a conservation area.

Provost

Provost thanked everyone in attendance for their contribution.

The meeting ended at 12.20 p.m.

DRAFT