

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Full Council

Wednesday, 4 April 2018 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

B J Quinn (Mayor)

C Portal Castro (Deputy Mayor)

M L Ayling, T G Belben, Dr H S Bloom, N J Boxall, B J Burgess, R G Burgess, R D Burrett, C A Cheshire, D Crow, C R Eade, R S Fiveash, F Guidera, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, M G Jones, S J Joyce, P K Lamb, R A Lanzer, T Lunnon, K McCarthy, C J Mullins, D M Peck, A Pendlington, M W Pickett, T Rana, R Sharma, A C Skudder, B A Smith, P C Smith, M A Stone, K Sudan, J Tarrant, G Thomas and L Vitler

Also in Attendance:

Mr Peter Nicolson

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Ann-Maria Brown	Head of Legal and Democratic Services
Chris Pedlow	Democratic Services Manager
Andrew Oakley	Electoral Services Manager

1. Disclosures of Interest

The disclosures of interests made by Councillors were set out in Appendix A to the minutes.

2. Communications

The Mayor invited representatives from each party to pay tribute to Councillors Stephen Joyce and Dr. Howard Bloom, who had both decided to stand down from the Council at the Borough Election in May, after a significant service both to Crawley Borough Council and to the residents of the Borough. Councillors Mullins, Crow, B. Smith, Burrett, Lamb, and the Mayor himself, paid their heartfelt respects with glowing and touching tributes to both Councillors who had serviced their residents and the Borough so diligently.

As part of the Mayor's communications he informed the Council of the sad passing of Ted Lynch OBE the Council's first Treasurer. Also noted that it was 50 years ago Martin Luther King was assassinated.

3. Public Question Time

Questions asked in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 were as follows:

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p>Mr Crane (Bewbush)</p> <p><i>Can you confirm that the New Town Hall and the other buildings being proposed to be built as part of that development, will they all be fully fitted with sprinklers for fire safety?</i></p> <p>Supplementary Question</p> <p><i>On the scheme in total, would the Council have to take out any loans to fund the schemes?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Skudder (Cabinet Member for Resources)</p> <p><i>Yes, I believe that they will. All the buildings would meet the required fire safety standards.</i></p> <p>Councillor Lamb (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>Yes, in line with the report that the Council had agreed, there would be some private financing as part of that.</i></p>
<p>Mr Browning (Three Bridges)</p> <p><i>My question relates to the proposed boundary changes relating to Tinsley Lane. The proposed boundary is the A211, which has a rammed footbridge and a road flyover, to Three Bridges. How do you justify this as to travel to Langley Green parade from Tinsley Lane residents would have to cross two major roads and the industrial area?</i></p> <p>Supplementary Question</p> <p><i>The crossing of Gatwick Road is greater than the A211, in my view and there are WSCC reports that mention this road's over capacity. Given this your justification doesn't seem to add up?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lunnon (Chair of Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>The principle focus of the boundary review across the Borough is to seek electoral equality. Unfortunately that has meant we've had to propose making boundaries that may not make everyone happy. But we've done our best at creating a proposal that should be acceptable by the Boundary Commission, otherwise they'll impose a set of boundaries on us that ignores the core neighbourhood values of Crawley.</i></p> <p>Councillor Lunnon (Chair of Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>I do understand your frustration that the proposed scheme that we are going to debate later, is not to your taste, but I believe it is the best and fairest scheme for the Borough as a whole.</i></p> <p><i>Councillor Burrett (Vice Chair of Governance Committee)</i></p> <p><i>In response to the original question, I don't believe the proposed scheme is justifiable and there is a scheme being proposed tonight that does keep the whole of Three Bridges together.</i></p>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p>Mr Tantrum (Three Bridges)</p> <p><i>It sounds that the decision of the boundaries has already been made?</i></p> <p>Supplementary Question</p> <p><i>We as residents vote you in and clearly there is a strong view amongst Tinsley Lane that the proposals are not acceptable. Votes will be influenced by the decision you take.</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lunnon (Chair of Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>Just to be clear we are discussing a report that has been discussed at both the Electoral Boundaries Working Group and Governance Committee. We are to discuss the recommendations from both of those bodies tonight and the Full Council will then be taking a decision of the Council's view of the proposed boundaries for submission.</i></p> <p>Councillor Lunnon (Chair of Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>As I mentioned previously, we understand that some residents may not be happy with the proposals but we had to look at the Town as a whole to achieve electoral equality.</i></p>
<p>Mr Jones (Three Bridges)</p> <p><i>I believe there are three criteria that needs to be considered when reviewing ward boundaries, but I've only heard about one, aren't the other two given equal weight and why haven't they been addressed?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lunnon (Chair of Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>The other two criteria are firstly Effective Local Government, which having checked, and does apply in this case is about over working of Councillors especially when relating to Parishes.</i></p> <p><i>The second community cohesion, there is an argument that Tinsley Lane as a location has more in common with Manor Royal, as they share services such as grass cutting with this area compared to Three Bridges.</i></p>
<p>Mrs Tantrum (Three Bridges)</p> <p><i>As you've mentioned the Boundary Commission guidelines state that the Wards should reflect interests and identities of the local communities. For Tinsley Lane you have ignored this completely, with all our local facilities being in Three Bridges. How can you ignore one of the most important criteria?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lunnon (Chair of Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>The proposed new ward is called Langley Green and Manor Royal, which is in essence split into two areas of interest one being Langley Green and the other which was Manor Royal which I believe has a clear communities of interests with Tinsley Lane. Especially with the housing developments proposed on Gatwick Road.</i></p>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p><i>I do not agree with what you've stated Manor Royal is a business area, whilst Tinsley Green is a residential Community. A Councillor representing Manor Royal won't look after us just the businesses or the residents over in Langley Green?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lunnon (Chair of Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>Telling future Councillors that they'll disregard your views seems unfair and I do not believe that would be the case no matter which party the Councillor was from.</i></p>
<p>Ms Handman (Furnace Green)</p> <p><i>Why has the Council found it acceptable to licence 9 of the Town Houses on Aintree Road as HMO's, which break the covenant on these properties over single occupation?</i></p> <p>Supplementary Question</p> <p><i>Who should be sued over the breaking of the covenant the Council or the landlords?</i></p>	<p>Councillor P. Smith (Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development)</p> <p><i>I don't know the answer, it's a planning matter. But if you leave your name, I'll get a written response to you on this matter.</i></p> <p>Councillor P. Smith (Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development)</p> <p><i>Again I'm sorry I'll have to write to you on this matter. But please feel free to directly contact me over this outside of the meeting. I am happy to discuss the matter further with you.</i></p>
<p>Mr Millar (Three Bridges)</p> <p><i>In preparation for the Boundary Review a survey was commissioned over how residents identified as a neighbourhood. As Three Bridges residents are the most affected by the proposals why were they invited to take part? Also how were people chosen to take part?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>The consultation was Borough wide and open to everyone. It was advertised in Crawley Live which gets delivered to every household. The Boundary Commission are forcing us to have 3 Member wards and that across the Town, not just Tinsley Lane. We are trying to evidence the importance of the Neighbourhood principle, and put forward an option with a mixed pattern of wards, but they may impose a 3 Member ward pattern on us and the boundaries would be altered even further. We know electoral equality is a key factor and that is what our proposed scheme is trying to achieve for the Borough as a whole.</i></p>

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 21 February 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

5. Items for debate (Reserved Items)

Members indicated that they wished to speak on a number of items as set out in the following table:

Minute Book Page no.	Committee/ Minute no. (and the Group reserving the item for Debate)	Subject (Decisions previously taken under delegated powers, reserved for debate only).	Subject (Recommendation to Council, reserved for debate)
Page 22	Planning Committee, 27 February 2018, Minute 4 Conservative Group WITHDRAWN	Planning Application CR/2016/0972/FUL – 44 Goffs Park Road, (formerly Oakhurst Grange), Southgate, Crawley.	
Suppl'tary Agenda Page 7	Cabinet 21 March 2018 Minute 5 Conservative Group	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	
Suppl'tary Agenda – Information to Follow Page 11	Cabinet 21 March 2018 Minute 12 Conservative Group	Building Cleaning Service Contract Award* (Part B- Exempt item)	
Suppl'tary Agenda – Information to Follow Page 14	Governance Committee, 26 March 2018 Minute 3 Both the Labour Group & Conservative Group		Recommendation 1(a) Electoral Review – Ward Patterns – Consideration of the Principle of Promoting a Mixed Pattern of Wards

Suppl'tary Agenda – Information to Follow Page 16	Governance Committee, 26 March 2018 Minute 3 Both the Labour Group & Conservative Group		Recommendation 1(b) Electoral Review – Ward Patterns – Consideration of the Mixed Pattern of Wards
---	--	--	---

6. Minutes of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Committees

Moved by Councillor Portal Castro (as the Deputy Mayor):-

RESOLVED

That the following reports be received:

- a) Planning Committee – 27 February 2018
- b) Planning Committee – 27 February 2018
- c) Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 19 March 2018
- d) Planning Committee – 20 March 2018
- e) Cabinet – 21 March 2018
- f) Governance Committee – 26 March 2018

7. Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme (Cabinet - 21 March 2018)

Councillor Burrett, on behalf of the Conservative Group, explained the rationale for bringing forward this item for debate. He commented that he welcomed this item and the way it has been dealt with generally. He was pleased that Cabinet allowed representations from Maidenbower Councillors during their meeting. He and his Ward colleagues had also intended to request to speak at the Cabinet, but it clashed with the new Forge Wood forum. The plans for Three Bridges Station does have a significant impact on his Ward, most residents were pleased with the proposals as it addressed the numerous issues associated with the station. But the concern with the current proposal of the no right turn, will make the possible rat run through St Mary's Drive and surrounding roads worse. He welcomed that the Cabinet have asked for further highways studies over the no right hand turn and traffic generally surrounding the station.

Councillors McCarthy, Lanzer, Irvine, Boxall, P. Smith and Lamb also spoke on this matter.

8. Building Cleaning Service Contract Award (Cabinet - 21 March 2018)

Councillor Burrett, on behalf of the Conservative Group, explained the rationale for bringing forward this item for debate. He commented that he was surprised that the minute showed that the Council had worked on the potential of an in-house bid, but wasn't submitted as it wasn't thought to have been competitive. He commented that he hoped we had moved away from the idea of having everything in-house and learnt

from the sheer cost of those days, but clearly not and hoped this was not a trend to come.

Councillor Lamb responded on this matter.

9. Electoral Review - Ward Patterns - Consideration of the Principle of Promoting a Mixed Pattern of Wards - Recommendation 1(a) (Governance Committee - 26 March 2018)

The Full Council considered report LDS/135 of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, which had been previously considered at the meeting of the Governance Committee on 26 March 2018.

Councillor Lunnon as the Chair of the Governance Committee, presented the report to the Full Council and highlighted that the Electoral Review - Ward Patterns, report contained two recommendations for their consideration and with agreement of the Mayor, each recommendation would be debated independently from one another.

Councillor Lunnon moved and presented the first recommendation which related to the consideration of the Principle of Promoting a Mixed Pattern of Wards. The proposal before the Full Council was that the Council's submission to the Electoral Boundary Commission for England should be a mixed pattern of wards namely that 10 Wards served by 3 Councillors and 3 Wards served by 2 Councillors. The approach was based on the Council's desire to retain the Borough's electoral division's in-line with the neighbourhood principle throughout Crawley.

Councillors Burrett seconded the recommendation and Councillor Crow spoke in support of the recommendation.

A recorded vote was requested and the Mayor then called for the vote.

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, Belben, Bloom, Boxall, B J Burgess, R G Burgess, Burrett, Cheshire, Crow, Eade, Fiveash, Guidera, Irvine, Jaggard, Jones, Joyce, Lamb, Lanzer, Lunnon, McCarthy, Mullins, Peck, Pendlington, Pickett, Portal Castro, Quinn, Rana, Sharma, Skudder, B A Smith, P C Smith, Stone, Sudan, Tarrant, Thomas and Vitler. (36)

Voting Against: Councillors: None (0)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

The Mayor declared the recommendation was carried in favour 36, and votes against 0 with 0 abstention.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves that the Council's submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England should be for a mixed pattern of Wards (10 Wards served by 3 Councillors and 3 Wards served by 2 Councillors).

10. Electoral Review - Ward Patterns - Consideration of the Mixed Pattern of Wards - Recommendation 1(b) (Governance Committee - 26 March 2018)

The Full Council considered report LDS/135 of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, which had been previously considered at the meeting of the Governance Committee on 26 March 2018.

Councillor Lunnon as the Chair of the Governance Committee, moved and presented the second recommendation which related to the consideration of the mixed Pattern of Wards. The proposal before the Full Council detailed a specific pattern of Wards and proposed Ward boundaries to be submitted as the Council's submission to the Electoral Boundary Commission for England. In moving the recommendation, it was emphasised that the proposal was focused on maintaining the neighbourhood principle, whilst achieving best as possible, electoral equality across the Borough. The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Lamb.

Councillor Crow moved his amendment, having been seconded by Councillor McCarthy, in doing so highlighted that his alternative Scheme would align electoral Ward boundaries closest to the neighbourhood principle whilst remaining within the limits of electoral variance.

During a passionate discussion on the two sets of boundary proposals, including debating both the merits and weaknesses of both moved proposals, Councillors McCarthy, R G Burgess, Burrett, Lamb, Lanzer, Thomas Guidera, Sudan, Dr Bloom, B J Burgess Irvine Pickett, and Jones all spoke on the item.

At the conclusion of the debate a recorded vote was requested on the proposed amendment and the Mayor then called for the vote.

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Belben, Dr Bloom, Boxall, B J Burgess, R G Burgess, Burrett, Crow, Eade, Guidera, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Peck, Pendlington, Stone, Tarrant, and Vitler. (17)

Voting Against: Councillors: Ayling, Cheshire, Fiveash, Irvine, Jones, Joyce, Lamb, Lunnon, Mullins, Pickett, Portal Castro, Quinn, Rana, Sharma, Skudder, B A Smith, P C Smith, Sudan, and Thomas. (19)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

The Mayor declared the proposed amendment had fallen by – votes in favour 17, and votes against 19 with 0 abstention.

A recorded vote was requested on the substantive motion and the Mayor then called for the vote.

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, Cheshire, Fiveash, Irvine, Jones, Joyce, Lamb, Lunnon, Mullins, Pickett, Portal Castro, Quinn, Rana, Sharma, Skudder, B A Smith, P C Smith, Sudan, and Thomas. (19)

Voting Against: Councillors: Belben, Dr Bloom, Boxall, B J Burgess, R G Burgess, Burrett, Crow, Eade, Guidera, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Peck, Pendlington, Stone, Tarrant, and Vitler. (17)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

The Mayor declared the proposed recommendation as approved – votes in favour 19, and votes against 17 with 0 abstention.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves for final submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, the mixed pattern of Wards submission as set out in the Appendix to minutes of the Governance Committee 26 March 2018. *(i.e. report LDS/135, Appendix A amended with the revision of Appendix C to report LDS/135).*

11. Duration of the Meeting (Guillotine)

As the business had not been completed within the scheduled 2 hours 30 minutes a vote on continuation, and in line with Council Procedure Rule 2.2, was held. The Mayor required the Full Council to consider if it wished to continue with the meeting.

Having put it to the vote, the Council agreed that the meeting be continued for an additional period not exceeding 30 minutes.

12. Councillors' Written Questions

It was noted that there were no Councillors' written questions submitted.

13. Announcements by Cabinet Members

Cabinet Member	Subject
Councillor Joyce (Cabinet Member for Housing)	<p><i>Councillor Joyce announced to the Full Council that on 29 March 2018, the Council had purchased the site of the College Car Park and stated the Council should be able to deliver 98 affordable housing on that site.</i></p> <p><i>He also commented that it was his final meeting and that he'd been on Cabinet for 6 years and in opposition for 6, Cabinet was more fun. Noting that during his time as Cabinet Member for Housing, there had either been built or started to build over 1000 new homes, which he was very proud of and he wished all Members the best for the future.</i></p>

14. Questions to Cabinet Members

Name of Councillor asking Question	Name of Cabinet Member Responding
<p>Councillor Crow to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>Does he agree with me that any Councillor that were a member of 'Momentum,' should declare that on their register of interest?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb – (Leader of the Council).</p> <p><i>I genuinely do not know if any of my colleagues were/ are a member of 'Momentum.' I am very diligent with my declarations, but if Momentum does fall within any of the categories, then yes it should be on the Councillor's register of interest forms</i></p>
<p>Councillor Lanzer to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>Can he update the current risk level of the combined heat and power network associated with the new Town Hall development? Also who would be running the installation of the network if it was to go ahead?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb – (Leader of the Council).</p> <p><i>This question should probably be addressed to the Cabinet Member for Resources, but what I can say is that as we are in active negotiation at present, unfortunately we cannot discuss too much on this issue in Part A session.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Eade to the Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p><i>Noting that we were in open session, but what level of confidence does he have that the New Town Hall project would remain under the figures originally debated?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Skudder - (Cabinet Member for Resources)</p> <p><i>Zero. As the figures had changed since the original report, which had been reported at the Scrutiny Commission in September 2017.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Guidera to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>My question relates to the disabled parking on the Broadway/ Crosskeys. I have seen numerous times recently, vehicles with blue badges receiving parking tickets. Having looked into it, it appears that three of the bays were our disabled residents being ticketed. I believe many of the tickets were then being rescinded. Would he consider looking into the Council's approach for ticketing in that area?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Thomas – (the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability)</p> <p><i>Recently I did however pick up a parking ticket from the floor in the Town Hall reception and took it to the parking team.</i></p> <p><i>However I don't have an answer now, as I'll have to look at this matter further. Please forward me any information so I can get to the heart of the issue. One thought though was that car park I believe was an NCP, rather one we own.</i></p>

<p>Councillor R Burgess to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>At the last Full Council I asked you a question 'are there any plans for the Council to commemorate the centenary of the Representations of the People's Act?' You replied that you would be speaking to our communications team over this. Can he provide an update on this?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb – (Leader of the Council).</p> <p><i>I believe I said I would speak to the relevant Cabinet Member on my right, which I have done and you'll find out our approach, in due course.</i></p>
<p>Councillor B Burgess to the Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p><i>Please can you reconfirm to me your answer to Councillor Eade's question? What does zero mean?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Skudder - (Cabinet Member for Resources)</p> <p><i>The figures have increased, so there is a zero percent chance of the figures remaining to the original figures. So in answer to what you are implying is, yes they have increased.</i></p>
<p>Councillor McCarthy to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>In regards to the parking ticket he picked up. Did the recipient who had left the ticket receive a fixed penalty notice for littering?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Thomas – (the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability)</p> <p>All I can say was that I passed the ticket to the relevant person.</p>

15. Questions to Committee Chairs

Name of Councillor asking Question	Name of Committee Chair Responding
<p>Councillor Crow to the Chair of the Governance Committee</p> <p><i>During the discussion on the Ward boundaries earlier he implied that my proposal would carve up more Wards, please can he elaborate which?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lunnon – (Chair of the Governance Committee)</p> <p><i>Yes, Bewbush, West Green and Northgate which is a number of Wards.</i></p>
<p>Councillor B Burgess to the Chair of the Licensing Committee</p> <p><i>Bearing in mind that the Licensing Committee seldom meets with the last meeting having been cancelled. How does the Chairman feel of holding licensing training sessions, if</i></p>	<p>Councillor Fiveash – (Chair of the Licensing Committee)</p> <p><i>Yes it a good idea. I'll look into it.</i></p>

<i>the meeting get cancelled instead?</i>	
---	--

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Full Council concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 10.15 pm

B J Quinn
Mayor

Appendix A

Councillors' Disclosures of Interest

Councillor	Item	Meeting & Minute	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor P C Smith	Planning Application CR/2017/0764/RG3 Fleming Way (West of Craters Brook), Northgate, Crawley	Planning Committee 27 February 2018 – Minute 6, Page 25	Personal Interest – a Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District
Councillor Burrett	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 19 March 2018 – Minute 5, Page 35	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 19 March 2018 – Minute 5, Page 35	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor B A Smith	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 19 March 2018 – Minute 5, Page 35	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burrett	Establishment of and Appointments to Scrutiny Panels – Social Mobility Scrutiny Panel	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 19 March 2018 – Minute 9, Page 36	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burrett	Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee (HASC)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 19 March 2018 – Minute 10, Page 36	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor P C Smith	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 19 March 2018 – Minute 5, Page 35	Personal Interest – a Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District

Councillor P C Smith	Planning Application CR/2017/0880/FUL First Choice House, London Rd, Northgate, Crawley	Planning Committee 20 March 2018 – Minute 4, Page 40	Personal Interest – a Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District
Councillor Burrett	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	Cabinet – 21 March 2018 – Minute 7, Sup Agenda Page 7	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	Cabinet – 21 March 2018 – Minute 7, Sup Agenda Page 7	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor P C Smith	Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme	Cabinet – 21 March 2018 – Minute 7, Sup Agenda Page 7	Personal Interest – a Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District