

Public Document Pack
Crawley Borough Council



Agenda of the Full Council

To: The Mayor and Councillors

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the **Full Council** which will be held in **Virtually - Microsoft Teams Live**, on **Wednesday, 15 July 2020** at **7.30 pm**

Nightline Telephone No. 07881 500 227

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anna Maria Brown'.

Head of Legal, Democracy and HR

Please contact Democratic Services if you have any queries regarding this agenda.
democratic.services@crawley.gov.uk

Published 7 July

Duration of the Meeting

If the business of the meeting has not been completed within two and a half hours (normally 10.00 pm), then in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 2.2, the Mayor will require the meeting to consider if it wishes to continue for a period not exceeding 30 minutes. A vote will be taken and a simple majority in favour will be necessary for the meeting to continue.

Following the meeting's initial extension, consideration will be given to extending the meeting by further periods of up to 30 minutes if required however, no further extensions may be called to extend the meeting beyond 11.00pm when the guillotine will come into effect.

Please note: in accordance with Regulations in response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, from April 2020 committee meetings will be held **virtually** via online video conferencing with committee members **in remote attendance only**. Any member of the public or press may observe a committee meeting (except where exempt information is to be discussed) via a link published on the Council's website **24 hours** before the scheduled start time.

In order to allow committee members to take decisions without disruption, only those Councillors who are members of the Committee or are presenting a report will be entitled to join the meeting feed. All other non-Committee members must view the meeting through the public feed. Exceptions to this will be made at the Chair's discretion and requires advance consent.

There will be no in-person public question time at any Council meeting while virtual Committee meetings are being held. All written questions submitted in **advance and accepted** in line with the Constitution will be published within a supplementary agenda. These will be read to the Committee and be followed by a response. The questioner will receive an emailed copy of the response given at the meeting. There will be



Switchboard: 01293 438000
Main fax: 01293 511803
Minicom: 01293 405202 DX:
57139 Crawley 1
www.crawley.gov.uk

Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
West Sussex
RH10 1UZ

The order of business may change at the Mayor's discretion

Part A Business (Open to the Public)

	Pages
1. Apologies for Absence	
To receive any apologies for absence.	
2. Disclosures of Interest	
In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, Councillors of the Council are reminded that it is a requirement to declare interests where appropriate.	
3. Election of Mayor 2020/ 2021	
To elect a Mayor for the Council year 2020/ 2021.	
4. Election of Deputy Mayor 2020/ 2021	
To elect a Deputy Mayor for the Council year 2020/ 2021.	
5. Minutes	5 - 22
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 26 February 2020.	
6. Communications including Vote of Thanks to the Retiring Mayor and their Consort.	
To receive and consider any announcements and communications.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Mayor will, during this item, move a vote of thanks to the Retiring Mayor and Mayor's Consort.*• It is noted that the current Youth Mayor (Leon Mukazi) and Youth Deputy Mayor (Shelly Sharma) are continuing their positions in 2020-21.• To receive any written Cabinet Members' announcements.	
<i>*NB – There will no presentation of Mayoral Badges to the Retiring Mayor due to the meeting taking place virtually. Instead this will take place at the first non-virtual Full Council meeting.</i>	

	Pages
<p>7. Notice of Motion 1 - Motion of No Confidence</p> <p>To consider, in accordance with Full Council Procedure Rule 1.2–H, the following Notice of Motion to be moved by Councillor Crow and seconded by Councillor McCarthy.</p>	23 - 24
<p>8. Review of Political Proportionality, Constitution of Committees and Appointments to Outside Organisations and Proposed Cabinet and their Portfolio Holder Responsibilities for 2020 - 2021</p> <p>To consider report LDS/159 of the Head of Legal, Democracy and HR. (<i>Report to Follow</i>)</p>	
<p>9. Public Question Time</p> <p>To answer public questions under Full Council Procedure Rule 1.2-D. The questions must be on matters which are relevant to the functions of the Council, and should not include statements.</p> <p>One supplementary question from the questioner will be allowed.</p> <p>Up to 30 minutes is allocated to Public Question Time.</p>	
<p>10. Consideration of Full Council Recommendations and Call-In Decisions</p> <p>To consider the following Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 3 – Appointment of Interim Monitoring Officer (page 25) • Recommendation 4 – Budget Monitoring – Quarter 4 – Cabinet – 24 June 2020 – (page 73) • Recommendation 5 – HRA Budget for Purchase of Land or Property – Cabinet – 24 June 2020 (<i>Part B item</i>) – (page 82) • Recommendation 6 – Decisions Taken Under Emergency Urgency Powers – Governance Committee – 6 July 2020 (To Follow) <p>There were no items Called-In to the Full Council for its consideration.</p> <p><i><u>NB</u> – In advance of the meeting Political Groups will identify which recommendations they <u>do not wish</u> to reserve for debate.</i></p>	25 - 26

	Pages
<p>11. Councillors' Questions Time</p> <p>There will be a maximum of 30 minutes for Councillors' Question Time (CQT). Councillors may ask questions relating to either a Portfolio issue or with regard to the functions delegated to a Committee.</p> <p>There are two methods for Councillors asking questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Councillors can submit written questions in advance of the meeting and written answers will be provided on the evening of the Full Council. 2. Councillors can verbally ask questions during the CQT. <p>Councillors have the opportunity to ask oral supplementary questions in relation to either of the methods above.</p>	
<p>12. Receiving the Minutes of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Other Committees including Items for Debate</p> <p>To receive the minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Committees, as listed on page 27, and set out in the appendices to this item and to debate any Reserved Items contained within those Minutes.</p> <p><i>NB: In advance of the meeting Political Groups can identify any items they wish to debate as a Reserved Item. These Reserved Items will then be the only matters to be the subject of debate.</i></p>	27 - 90
<p>13. Supplemental Agenda</p> <p>Any urgent item(s) complying with Section 100(B) of the Local Government Act 1972.</p>	

This information is available in different formats and languages. If you or someone you know would like help with understanding this document please contact the Democratic Services Team on 01293 438549 or email: democratic.services@crawley.gov.uk

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Full Council

Wednesday, 26 February 2020 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

R Sharma (Mayor)

S Malik (Deputy Mayor)

M L Ayling, A Belben, T G Belben, B J Burgess, R G Burgess, R D Burrett, D Crow, C R Eade, R S Fiveash, M Flack, F Guidera, J Hart, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, G S Jhans, M G Jones, P K Lamb, R A Lanzer, T Lunnon, T McAleney, K McCarthy, J Millar-Smith, C J Mullins, M Mwagale, D M Peck, A Pendlington, J Purdy, T Rana, B A Smith, P C Smith and K Sudan

Also in Attendance:

Mr Peter Nicolson

Appointed Independent Person

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl

Chief Executive

Ann-Maria Brown

Head of Legal, Democracy and HR

Ian Duke

Deputy Chief Executive

Chris Pedlow

Democratic Services Manager

Karen Hayes

Head of Corporate Finance

Patricia Salami

Station Programme Manager

Clem Smith

Head of Economy and Planning

Mez Matthews

Democratic Services Officer

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor M W Pickett

Absent:

Councillor L M Ascough

1. Minute Silence and Tributes to Former Mayor and Leader of the Council Dr Howard Bloom

The Full Council observed a minute's silence in memory of Dr Howard Bloom, a former Mayor and Leader of the Council who had sadly and suddenly passed away.

The Mayor then invited representatives from each party to pay tribute to Dr Bloom. Councillors Crow, B. Smith, Lanzer, Lamb, Burrett, Mullins and the Mayor on behalf of the Council paid their respects with heartfelt and touching tributes.

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (64)
26 February 2020

2. Disclosures of Interest

The disclosures of interests made by Councillors are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

3. Items for debate (Reserved Items)

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

Page no.	Committee/ Minute no. <i>(and the Member reserving the item for Debate)</i>	Subject <i>(Decisions previously taken under delegated powers, reserved for debate only).</i>	Subject <i>(Recommendation to Full Council, reserved for debate)</i>
p.40	Governance Committee, 29 January 2020 (Minute 4) Labour and Conservative Groups		Adoption of the New Constitution – (Recommendation 2)
p.50	Cabinet 5 February 2020, (Minute 6) Labour and Conservative Groups		2020/21 Budget and Council Tax (Recommendation 3)
p.52	Cabinet 5 February 2020, (Minute 6) Conservative Group		Treasury Management Strategy 2020/2021 (Recommendation 4)
p.58	Planning Committee 10 February 2020. (Minute 6) Conservative Group	Planning Application CR/2019/0802/FUL - Bloc Hotel, South Terminal, Perimeter Road East, Gatwick, Crawley.	
p.61	Full Council Agenda		Notice of Precept (Recommendation 5)

4. 2020/21 Budget and Council Tax - Cabinet - 5 February 2020 (Recommendation 3)

The Leader of the Council presented report [FIN/491](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance which set out the Budget and level of Council Tax for the year 2020/21. It was noted that the report detailed each of the Revenue, Capital and Housing Revenue Accounts that combine together to formulate 'The Budget'. In proposing the level of Council Tax for the Financial Year 2020/21, each of those accounts identified had been considered. The proposed Council Tax for 2020/21 was to be increased by 2.43%. It was noted that the report had been considered by the Cabinet on 5 February 2020 and by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 3 February 2020. In presenting The Budget to the Council, Councillor Lamb also confirmed that he was happy to accept the [Conservative Amendment](#) to the proposal (Recommendation 3), which was detailed in item 16 of the Supplemental Agenda, and as such it would be included as a part of the proposed substantive Budget before the Council. The Budget report, with the inclusion of the amendment, was seconded by Councillor P. Smith.

The Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Duncan Crow addressed the meeting and made his budget speech which included thanking Councillor Lamb for accepting the Conservative Amendment to the Budget. The Mayor then opened up the general debate on the proposed Budget report as amended to the Council. Councillors Guidera, Lanzer, Irvine, Burrett, Mullins, Lunnon, Sudan and Jhans spoke during the debate with Councillor Lamb then using his right to reply.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Councillors expressed their thanks and appreciation for the work carried out by Karen Hayes (Head of Corporate Finance), the Finance Division generally and the Budget Advisory Group (BAG).

The Full Council was reminded that regulations required all Councils at their annual budget meetings to adopt the practice of recorded votes - that is, recording in the minutes of the meeting how each member present voted on any decision relating to the Annual Budget and Council Tax. This applied not only to substantive budget motions to agree the Budget and setting Council Taxes, including precepts, but also on any amendments proposed.

Following the conclusion of the debate, the Mayor invited the Head of Legal, Democracy and HR to commence the recorded voting process on the 2020/21 Budget and Council Tax as amended. The names of the Councillors voting for and against Recommendation 3 were recorded as set out below:

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, A Belben, T Belben, B Burgess, R Burgess, Burrett, Crow, Eade, Fiveash, Flack, Guidera, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Jones, Lamb, Lanzer, Lunnon, Malik, McAleney, McCarthy, Millar-Smith, Mullins, Mwagale, Peck, Pendlington, Purdy, Rana, Sharma, B Smith, P Smith and Sudan. (33)

Voting Against: Councillors: None (0)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

The Mayor declared the recommendation was carried – votes in favour 33, and votes against 0 with 0 abstention.

RESOLVED

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (66)
26 February 2020

That the Full Council approves the following items regarding the 2020/21 Budget:

- a) the proposed 2020/21 General Fund Budget including savings and growth as set out in section 6 and Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of the report [FIN/491](#), with the allocation of £49,000 for the proposed permanent Income Generation Officer position, to be amended to be either a one year fixed-term position or a one-off hiring of consultants for this purpose
- b) the proposed 2020/21 Housing Revenue Account Budget as set out in section 10 and Appendix 3 of the report [FIN/491](#),
- c) the 2019/20 to 2022/23 Capital Programme and funding as set out in paragraph 11.5 of the report [FIN/491](#),
- d) that the Council's share of Council Tax for 2020/21 be increased by 2.43% from £203.94 to £208.89 for a band D property as set out in paragraphs 5.5.1 and 13.3 of report [FIN/491](#),
- e) the Pay Policy Statement for 2020/2021 as outlined in paragraph 16.3 and Appendix 6 of the report [FIN/491](#),

5. Notice of Precept 2020/2021- (Recommendation 5)

Councillor Lamb presented and moved the report that set out the [Notice of Precept](#) from the Police and Crime Commissioner for Sussex and West Sussex County Council, which combined with the previously agreed Crawley Borough Council precept to formulate the 2020/21 Council Tax Resolution for 2020/21.

The recommendation was seconded by Councillor P. Smith.

Following approval of the Council's Budget and Council Tax 2020/21 in Recommendation 3, and in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the names of the Councillors voting for and against Recommendation 5 were recorded as set out below:-

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, A Belben, T Belben, B Burgess, R Burgess, Burrett, Crow, Eade, Fiveash, Flack, Guidera, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Jones, Lamb, Lanzer, Lunnon, Malik, McAleney, McCarthy, Millar-Smith, Mullins, Mwagale, Peck, Pendlington, Purdy, Rana, Sharma, B Smith, P Smith and Sudan. (33)

Voting Against: Councillors: None (0)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

The Mayor declared the recommendation was carried – votes in favour 33, and votes against 0 with 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED

1. That it be noted that on 24 December 2019 the Leader of the Council under delegated powers calculated the Council Tax Base 2020/21 for the whole Council area as **35,811.9** [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (67)
26 February 2020

2. That the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2020/21 is calculated at £7,480,748.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2020/21 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

(a)	£116,777,379	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
(b)	£109,296,631	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
(c)	£7,480,748	being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
(d)	£208.89	being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
(e)	£0	being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
(f)	£208.89	being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

4. That it be noted that the County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Sussex have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.
5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2020/21 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (68)
26 February 2020

COUNCIL TAX SCHEDULE 2020/21

	CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR SUSSEX	TOTAL
BAND A	139.26	959.16	133.27	1,231.69
BAND B	162.47	1,119.02	155.49	1,436.98
BAND C	185.68	1,278.88	177.70	1,642.26
BAND D	208.89	1,438.74	199.91	1,847.54
BAND E	255.31	1,758.46	244.33	2,258.10
BAND F	301.73	2,078.18	288.76	2,668.67
BAND G	348.15	2,397.90	333.18	3,079.23
BAND H	417.78	2,877.48	399.82	3,695.08

6. That it be determined in accordance with Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992 that the Council 's basic amount of Council Tax for 2020/21 is NOT excessive in accordance with principles approved by the Secretary of State under Section 52ZC of the Act.

6. Public Question Time

There were no questions from the public.

*Councillor Lanzer left the Chamber in advance of the debate on the next two items.
(Petitions – "No Right Turn - Three Bridges Station Objection" and Notice of Motion 1 – Three Bridges Station)*

7. Petition - "No Right Turn - Three Bridges Station Objection"

The Full Council considered the e-petition which had been received by the Council's Petitions Officer. As the petition contained over 1000 valid signatures it was required to be debated by Full Council. The petition stated as follows "No Right Turn – Three Bridges Station Objection".

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (69)
26 February 2020

“We the undersigned Petition the council to commence a further consultation on this issue, including viable options for the retention of the right turn out of the station forecourt, and ensuring that the consultation period lasts for a sufficient period of time and is adequately publicised in order to ensure that all key stakeholders are able to participate fully.”

“We wish to register our concerns at the implications of the loss of the right turn out of Three Bridges Station proposed as part of the re-design proposals which have recently been the subject of consultation by Crawley Borough Council, due to the negative effects we believe this will have on local residents. We also wish to express our concern about the short timeframe in which the consultation took place, and the level of publicity afforded to ensuring that all interested parties were able to have their say effectively.”

As the Petition related to a responsibility of the Cabinet, the Cabinet was required to take the final decision. The Full Council was however required to consider the petition and decide whether or not to make recommendations to inform the decision of the Cabinet. In accordance with the Council's petition Scheme, the Full Council had a maximum of 30 minutes to consider the petition.

Janet Seymour, the Principal Petitioner, presented the petition to the Full Council (the presentation is attached as Appendix B to these minutes).

Councillor P Smith, as Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development, addressed the meeting, thanking the Principal Petitioner for submitting the petition. Councillor P Smith then made the following points:

- As a long-term resident of northern Crawley he used Three Bridges Station on a frequent basis.
- The petition requested that viable options be considered which retained the right-hand turn. Although the project was being managed by Crawley Borough Council, highways were the responsibility of West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and as such that element of the development was not the responsibility of Crawley Borough Council and would be deferred to WSCC.
- Had it been feasible to incorporate a right-hand turn into the Scheme it would have been retained. Ultimately no right-hand turn had been incorporated into the design as its retention had not been deemed feasible.
- Three consultation exercises had already been undertaken in relation to the Scheme. As a result of those consultations adjustments had been made to the Scheme including a new access to the eastern platform of the station, and engaging a company to carry out traffic modelling to inform the design options.
- Further consultation would not add value.

Councillor P Smith then moved recommendation 2(b) which was seconded by Councillor Irvine. Recommendation 2(b) proposed that the petition be noted and that Cabinet be asked (at its meeting on 11 March 2020) to consider the contents of the petition.

A debate then took place, during which Councillor McCarthy moved recommendation 2(c) which was seconded by Councillor Burrett as they fully supported the petition and, as a Ward Councillors for Pound Hill North & Forge Wood, felt that they could not support the redevelopment as it stood. Recommendation 2(c) proposed that the petition be supported, and that Cabinet be asked (at its meeting on 11 March 2020) to commence a further consultation on the issue, including viable options for the retention of the right turn out of the station forecourt, and that it be ensured that the

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (70)
26 February 2020

consultation period lasted for a sufficient period of time and was adequately publicised in order to ensure that all the key stakeholders were able to participate fully.

During the debate Councillors A Belben, T Belben, Burrett and Purdy spoke on the issues and expressed views including:

- Engagement of stakeholder views had been lacking.
- The lack of feedback provided to residents had led to the large number of petition signatories.
- Due to the increase in distance vehicles would be required to travel as a result of the loss of the right-hand turn, vehicle emissions in the area would increase.
- The data obtained through the traffic modelling survey did not truly represent average traffic movements as it had been carried out during a period when there was reduced traffic movement (ie end of school year and school activities week).
- The loss of the right-hand turn would also affect those who travelled from outside the Borough to use the station. Those users, as they were not Crawley residents, had not been entitled to sign the petition.
- The loss of the right-hand turn would increase the use of the surrounding roads, including St Mary's Drive, where congestion was already an issue.
- Some information contained within the traffic modelling survey was incorrect (such as increased travel distance and time due to the re-routing as a result of the loss of the right-hand turn) which called into question the accuracy of other information within the survey.

Councillor Lamb, as Leader of the Council and as Chair of the Cabinet, then addressed the Full Council and made the following points:

- It had been demonstrated that there was high demand for bike racks at the station.
- The current right-hand turn delayed all traffic in the areas.
- The Cabinet would re-contact West Sussex County Council as Highways Authority to ascertain whether there was a remotely conceivable way in which a right-hand turn could be accommodated.
- It would only be possible for the Scheme to move forward if it was 'signed off' by West Sussex County Council as the Highways Authority.
- If the Scheme did not go ahead then any money allocated to the project would need to be returned and could not be spent.

As recommendation 2(b) ("that the petition be noted and that Cabinet be asked (at its meeting on 11 March 2020) to consider the contents of the petition") had been moved and seconded first during the debate it was then voted upon. The Mayor called for a recorded vote as Council Procedure Rule 18.5 required that all petitions considered by Full Council be subject to a recorded vote where the decision was not unanimous:

Voting in favour of Recommendation 2(b): *M Ayling, R Fiveash, M Flack, J Hart, I Irvine, G Jhans, M Jones, P Lamb, T Lunnnon, S Malik, T McAleney, C Mullins, T Rana, R Shama, B Smith, P Smith and K Sudan* (17)

Voting against recommendation 2(b): *A Belben, T Belben, B Burgess, R Burgess, R Burrett, D Crow, C Eade, F Guidera, K Jaggard, K McCarthy, J Millar-Smith, M Mwagale, D Peck, A Pendlington and J Purdy* (15).

Abstentions: *None* (0).

The Mayor declared that recommendation 2(b) had been carried – 17 votes in favour, and 15 votes against with no votes of abstentions.

RESOLVED

1. That the contents of the petition and the views expressed by the Principal Petitioner be received.
2. That the petition be noted and that Cabinet be asked (at its meeting on 11 March 2020) to consider the contents of the petition.

8. Notice of Motion 1- Three Bridges Station

The Council considered the Notice of Motion 1 'Three Bridges Station' as set out in the Full Council's agenda. The Motion was moved and presented by Councillor McCarthy and seconded and supported by Councillor Jaggard.

Councillor P. Smith moved and presented the [Labour amendment](#), (as shown in *Supplementary Agenda Order Paper*). The amendment was seconded and supported by Councillor Lamb.

During the lengthy and passionate debate both on the original Notice of Motion and the proposed amendment, Councillors T. Belben, Irvine, Burrett, Malik, Guidera, Lunnon, B Burgess, Pendlington and A Belben all spoke during the debate on the merit on the original Notice of Motion and the proposed Amendment before the Full Council.

9. Duration of the Meeting (Guillotine)

Councillor Lanzer returned to the Chamber for the vote on the use of 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 Full Council agreed that the meeting be continued for an additional period not exceeding 30 minutes.

Councillor Lanzer then left the Chamber in advance of the continuation of the debate on Notice of Motion 1 – Three Bridges Station.

10. Notice of Motion 1 - Three Bridges Station (Continued)

Following the resumption of the debate Councillor McCarthy used his right to reply to speak at the end of the debate.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the proposed Labour Amendment to the Motion, which was carried by 17 votes in Favour, 15 Against and 0 Abstentions

The Notice of Motion as amended was then agreed.

RESOLVED

“This Council recognises the importance of Three Bridges Station to the whole town, and welcomes the completion of the recent consultation on the forecourt development designs.

Whilst the Council supports the key principles of the scheme, and welcomes the many benefits this will bring for all users of the station complex, it also recognises the significant and widespread concerns expressed by a large number of respondents to the recent consultation exercise and by a much greater number of residents who participated in the recent e-petition, all of whom have very grave reservations about the loss of the right turn movement out of the station and the negative effects this will have for drivers leaving the station to travel to Pound Hill, Maidenbower, Worth, Forge Wood and villages to the east of the town, and on taxi drivers and their passengers, all of whom will suffer increased journey times as a result of not being able to turn right out of the station.

In the light of the significant public concern, the Council resolves to ask the Cabinet to request that West Sussex County Council provide an alternative scheme based on either a modified version of the previously considered Option 3 as detailed in the Traffic Modelling Summary dated January 2020, or on similar alternatives, to retain the right turn out of the station complex, and to carry out a further public consultation exercise on any new scheme the County Council produces on this basis.”

Councillor Lanzer returned to the Chamber at the conclusion of the debate.

11. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on [16 December 2019](#) approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

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

Moved by Councillor Malik (as the Deputy Mayor):-

RESOLVED

That the following reports be received:

Planning Committee – 17 December 2019
Planning Committee – 14 January 2020
Cabinet – 15 January 2020
Licensing Committee – 20 January 2020
Governance Committee – 29 January 2020
Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 3 February 2020
Cabinet – 5 February 2020
Planning Committee – 10 February 2020

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (73)
26 February 2020

Moved by Councillor Malik (as the Deputy Mayor):-

That the recommendation contained in the reports on the following matters, which had not been reserved for debate, be adopted:-

Councillors' Allowances Independent Remuneration Panel 2020 – Governance Committee – 29 January 2020 (Recommendation 1)

The Full Council considered report [LDS/156](#) of the Head of Legal, Democracy and HR which previously been considered by the Governance Committee – 29 January 2020

RESOLVED

That Full Council approves the extension of the current Councillors' Allowances Scheme to encompass the 2020/21 financial year.

13. Adoption of the New Constitution - Governance Committee, 29 January 2020 (Recommendation 2)

The Full Council considered report [LDS/157](#) of the Head of Legal, Democracy and HR, which had previously been considered by the Governance Committee on 29 January 2020. The Chair of the Governance Committee presented the report, and in doing so moved the Recommendation, which detailed the proposed draft new Constitution of the Council and the process used to devise the new document. It was explained that the draft new Constitution had been written in association with, and unanimously endorsed by, the Constitution Review Working Group (CRWG), based on the principles agreed by the Governance Committee at its meeting on 15 March 2017.

The aim of the Review had been to produce a Constitution which was more user friendly, fit for purpose and modern in structure, to enable users to take decisions and/or understand procedures and protocols in a manner that encouraged efficiency. The proposed Constitution was now 220 pages (it had been 496 pages at the start of the Review), and the new version was clearer and easier to both read and use. It was asked that thanks be recorded to Chris Pedlow (Democratic Services Manager) and Mez Matthews (Democratic Services Officer) for their hard work on the rewrite of the Constitution. Councillor Burrett, as the Vice Chair of Governance seconded the recommendation and the report also endorsing thanks to the officers.

Councillor Crow moved and presented the [Conservative amendment](#), (as shown in *Supplementary Agenda Order Paper*). The amendment was seconded and supported by Councillor Lanzer.

The Mayor then opened up the general debate on Recommendation 2 and the proposed Amendment. Councillor Jones spoke on item, which was followed by a Motion moved by Councillor Lamb and seconded by Councillor McAleney of '*putting the Recommendation/ Amendments to the vote*'. The Mayor called for a vote on the procedural motion which was carried by 18 Votes in Favour, 13 votes Against with 2 Abstentions.

The Mayor then held a vote on the Conservative Amendment, which fell by 16 votes For and 17 votes Against with 0 Abstention.

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (74)
26 February 2020

The Mayor then called for a vote on the substantive Recommendation 2 which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

That Full Council

- a) approves the new Constitution as set out [here](#), noting the trial element of Written Public Questions and extending the provision for Public Question Times.
- b) delegates that the Monitoring Officer bring the adoption of the new Constitution into effect as soon as practicable.

14. Treasury Management Strategy 2020/2021 - Cabinet -5 February 2020 - (Recommendation 4)

The Full Council considered report [FIN/493](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance, which had previously been considered by the Cabinet on 5 February 2020 and by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 3 February 2020. The Leader of the Council presented the report advising that the strategy covered two main areas: treasury management issues and capital related matters. It was highlighted that the Council had a statutory requirement to produce a Treasury Management Strategy.

Councillor Crow also spoke on the item and the recommendation.

Councillor Lamb moved the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor P. Smith.

The Mayor then called for a vote on Recommendation 4, which was carried by 17 votes in Favour, 0 Against and 15 Abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves:

- a) the Treasury Prudential Indicators and the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement contained within Section 5 of report [FIN/493](#);
- b) the Treasury Management Strategy contained within Section 6 of report [FIN/493](#);
- c) the Investment Strategy contained within Section 7, and the detailed criteria included in Appendix 3 of report [FIN/493](#).

15. Duration of the Meeting (Guillotine)

As the business had not been completed within the additional period of 30 minutes after the vote on continuation, and in line with Council Procedure Rule 2.2, the Mayor required the Full Council to consider if it wished to continue with the meeting and having put it to the Full Council, the meeting was continued for an additional period not exceeding 30 minutes.

16. Planning Application CR/2019/0802/FUL - Bloc Hotel, South Terminal, Perimeter Road East, Gatwick, Crawley - Planning Committee - 10 February 2020.

Councillor Jaggard advised that her rationale for bringing the item forward was that she had been quite shocked that the application included hotel bedrooms without any window or access to natural light. She was also concerned that there was no Council policy objecting to hotels not having any window or access to natural light. Whilst she understood, by the nature of the hotel being at the airport terminals, that most users only stayed for one night, it was still felt that other premises might use the Bloc Hotel as a precedent and include hotels room without any window or access to natural light. She hoped that the Council could change its policies to ensure that loophole was not exploited.

Councillors Guidera, P. Smith and Sharma all spoke on the issue and supported the concerned raised.

Councillor Malik, as the Chair of the Planning Committee, ended the debate commenting that he also support a change in policy on the matter and stated that he would speak to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development over addressing the issue as a matter of urgency.

17. Communications

The Mayor reported that as 2019 had been the 550th anniversary of Sikhism's founder Guru Nanak he had attended a number of functions in relation to the celebration. He also drew the Full Council's attention to the significance of this anniversary given the recent appointment of the Council's first Sikh Cabinet Member. The Mayor had also hosted the Mayor's Christmas Ball where he had felt the absence of former Councillor, Leader and Mayor Dr Howard Bloom.

18. Councillors' Written Questions

Councillors' written questions, together with the answers, were published in advance of the start of the meeting with the Council's Supplementary Agenda under item 11

Questions were as follows:-

Questioner:	Councillor Lunnon
Addressed to:	Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development
Subject(s):	The modelling exercise used for considering options within regarding the potential for a right turn as part of the Three Bridges station

Questioner:	Councillor Burrett
Addressed to:	Leader of the Council
Subject(s):	Number of FTE's the Council employees and the number of staff disciplinary cases, and staff grievance cases dealt with by the Council

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (76)
26 February 2020

19. Announcements by Cabinet Members

Cabinet Member	Announcement
Councillor B Smith (Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement).	<i>I wanted to inform the Council that we are now receiving applications for grants from our voluntary organisations and they would be going through the Council in the normal way. I believe we should be grateful for the work of the voluntary organisations because without them this town would be a much poorer place. Charities provide many services to the town and its residents which the Borough or County Councils cannot provide, and many residents benefit greatly from the services provided by those charities. The Council will do its best to fulfil the requests of those charities who submit a grant application. I want to thank the charities for the work they do for us all.</i>

20. Questions to Cabinet Members

Name of Councillor asking Question	Name of Cabinet Member Responding
Councillor Guidera to the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing <i>You very generously and kindly visited Chichester Close Playground with Councillor Mwangale when she was newly elected back in October and it is worse now than it was then. We visited the playground and, I don't know why, but there is now fencing erected around the swings which are all wrapped up so now, what is left of the park is essentially a really knackered old roundabout, the larger slide and then the older slide (which is for the toddlers) which I don't believe is fit for purpose and I don't think any toddler should be playing on it. The other thing is the wooden fencing is half missing around the corner so all that money spent on the path and gate, which I assume was to prevent dogs running into the park, doesn't have any effect as it is now wide open to any</i>	Councillor Mullins (Cabinet Member for Wellbeing) <i>I have been discussing this very recently and we do see how important the state of Chichester Close Play Area is. It has been moved right up the list in priority and it will get done as soon as possible. We are about to constitute a small working party (cross-benches) to re-assess the unsupervised play areas because the original list we had is now somewhat out of date and we are getting further reports in about the deterioration of some of the older ones. Obviously we should be proud of the ones we have refurbished, but some of the older ones are in a state now and we are doing a reassessment. I can assure you and Councillor Mwangale that I was quite shocked at the condition of the Chichester Close one and I will make</i>

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (77)
26 February 2020

<p><i>stray dogs (and in fact there is a stray dog that runs around that field which is regularly reported on). Do you have any idea of how quickly we can expect some kind of changes to the situation?</i></p>	<p><i>sure that it gets an early priority. It is not possible to give a timescale but we will get a working party together and, if you wanted to put yourself forward for it, you will be able to discuss the details there.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Eade to the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing</p> <p><i>A few years ago I met with you, officers and teenage skaters at Southgate Park where we discussed an extension for the learners and less skilled skaters to use. Has there been any progress on that?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Mullins (Cabinet Member for Wellbeing)</p> <p><i>Now you have raised it with me I will raise it at my Portfolio Briefing this Friday and see where we are with it. I can't answer the question tonight, but I will look into it.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Crow to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement</p> <p><i>In just over two months' time in early May we have a very special date which is Friday 8 May which is the 75th anniversary of VE day and the Government have designated that day to be a Bank Holiday. Does the Council have any plans to commemorate, or know of any events taking place in the town because, quite sadly, this will probably be the last major anniversary of VE Day where we will have the veterans, and others who were adults at that time, who will remember it and so it quite a significant event. If you could update us in any way I would really welcome that.</i></p>	<p>Councillor B Smith (Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement)</p> <p><i>This has come to my attention due to my involvement in an organisation I belong to. I also understand from the Leader that he has already raised this with the Communications Team and they are looking at what we are going to do. I agree with Councillor Crow that this is a very important date and it is something that we should acknowledge and promote. I will certainly look at encouraging the Council. We have in the past done some work with the Army Ground in Kilnmead Road and I think we should do the same again. We will look at that and bring some suggestions to the Council. If you have any suggestions I would be pleased to have them.</i></p>
<p>Councillor B Burgess to the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing</p> <p><i>What were the reasons we lost our Green Flag in the Memorial Gardens and what is proposed in order to gain the award?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Mullins (Cabinet Member for Wellbeing)</p> <p><i>We have consistently got the Green Flag for the park so we will probably look at that again. This is another one I will raise at my Portfolio Briefing to see where we are going with it and I will come back to you.</i></p>

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (78)
26 February 2020

<p>Councillor T Belben to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>What is the Council's strategy to accommodate the need for more electric charging points in the town?</i></p>	<p>Councillor G Jhans (Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability)</p> <p><i>Thank you for that question. We have our draft Transport Strategy out for consultation at the moment and there are a number of recommendations and plans for car sharing and also for electric vehicle charging points so that is a point to look into. I will also talk to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development to see what else we could potentially do in the future.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Hart to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement</p> <p><i>Carrying on from Councillor Crow's question relating to commemorations for VE Day in May, is the Council planning on doing anything to commemorate VJ Day (Victory in Japan) on 15 August as some people would class that as the end of the War?</i></p>	<p>Councillor B Smith (Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement)</p> <p><i>It is not something we have been looking at and have discussed, but I am happy to take it forward and I will talk to the Communications Team about it. We will look at both. Thank you.</i></p>

21. Questions to Committee Chairs

Name of Councillor asking Question	Name of Committee Chair Responding
<p>Councillor Lanzer to the Chair of the Planning Committee</p> <p><i>There was recently a planning application at Steers Lane for 185 new homes which has been granted on appeal. How did it get into the appeal process? I understand it was because we ran out of time to make the determination ourselves, if that is the case, why did that happen?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Malik – (Chair of the Planning Committee).</p> <p><i>Just to confirm that I am replying, not as the Deputy Mayor but as the Chair of the Planning Committee. I cannot recall the application you are referring to, but I will find out about it and get back to you.</i></p>

Agenda Item 5

Full Council (79)
26 February 2020

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Full Council concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 10.57 pm

R Sharma
(Mayor)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

Full Council

15 July 2020

NOTICE OF MOTION 1 – MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE

Mover Councillor Crow and Seconder Councillor McCarthy

This Council resolves:

Due to the Labour Administration losing its majority at the Council and that at the time of tabling this motion, no cross-party agreements have been reached on the future running of the Council until elections can be held in May 2021, this Council has no confidence in the current Leader and Labour Administration to be able to deliver for the residents of Crawley. Therefore, this motion seeks the removal from office of the Leader.

This page is intentionally left blank

Interim Appointment of Acting Monitoring Officer

CEx/51

The Leader to move the following Item (**Recommendation 3**):

Interim Appointment of Acting Monitoring Officer.

1. Purpose and Background

- 1.1 The Council has a statutory duty to appoint a Monitoring Officer, under Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 as one of its designated Officers.
- 1.2 The Council's Monitoring Officer may not also be the Council's Chief Finance Officer (151) or the Chief Executive/Head of Paid Service.
- 1.3 The Council's Current Monitoring Officer – Ann-Maria Brown, Head of Legal, Democracy and HR, will leave Crawley Borough Council on the 30 September 2020, when the post of Monitoring Officer will become vacant.
- 1.4 The Council is therefore required to appoint to an interim Monitoring Officer, until such time as a permanent Monitoring Officer is appointed and in post.

2. Recommendation –

Recommendation 3

That Full Council be recommended:

1. That with effect from 1 October 2020 Chris Pedlow (*Democratic Services Manager and current Deputy Monitoring Officer*) be appointed Interim Monitoring Officer until a permanent appointment is made, which will be presented to the Full Council in due course.
2. That the Interim Monitoring Officer be empowered to amend the Council's Constitution and the relevant Sub-Delegation Schemes to take into account the above appointment, to ensure that the Council is able to function seamlessly in the interim.

3. Reasons for the Recommendations

- 3.1 To comply with the provision of Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 in respect of the requirement to designate one of its Officers as the Monitoring Officer.
- 3.2 To ensure that the Council is operating appropriately in accordance with statutory requirements and with the necessary advice and guidance required through a Monitoring Officer.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 12

The list of minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Committees are set out in the following

Appendix

- 12 a) Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 9 March 2020 (*page 29*)
- 12 b) Planning Committee – 10 March 2020 (*page 37*)
- 12 c) Cabinet – 11 March 2020 (*page 41*)
- 12 d) Planning Committee – 27 April 2020 (*page 53*)
- 12 e) Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 8 June 2020 (*page 59*)
- 12 f) Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 22 June 2020 (*page 65*)
- 12 g) Cabinet – 24 June 2020 (*page 71*)
- 12 h) Planning Committee – 29 June 2020 (*page 85*)
- 12 i) Governance Committee – 6 July 2020 (*To Follow*)

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Monday, 9 March 2020 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

T Rana (Chair)

T G Belben (Vice-Chair)

M L Ayling, R G Burgess, R D Burrett, J Hart, R A Lanzer, A Pendlington and K Sudan

Also in Attendance:

Councillor B J Burgess, K L Jaggard and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Ian Duke	Deputy Chief Executive
Heather Girling	Democratic Services Officer
Chris Pedlow	Democratic Services Manager
Patricia Salami	Station Programme Manager
Louise Skipton-Carter	Sustainability Manager
Clem Smith	Head of Economy and Planning

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor R S Fiveash

Absent:

Councillor T McAleney

1. Disclosures of Interest and Whipping Declarations

The following disclosures were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor R D Burrett	Three Bridges Station Improvement Final Design (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	Three Bridges Station Improvement Final Design (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC

Councillor R A Lanzer	Three Bridges Station Improvement Final Design (Minute 4)	Prejudicial Interest - WSCC Deputy Representative on the Coast To Capital (C2C) Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Board
Councillor R A Lanzer	Three Bridges Station Improvement Final Design (Minute 4)	Prejudicial Interest - WSCC member on the C2C LEP Investment Committee
Councillor R A Lanzer	Three Bridges Station Improvement Final Design (Minute 4)	Prejudicial Interest - WSCC Cabinet Member for Economy and Corporate Resources responsible for the growth deals including Crawley
Councillor K Sudan	Three Bridges Station Improvement Final Design (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R D Burrett	New Directions for Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	New Directions for Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor K Sudan	New Directions for Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 3 February 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. Public Question Time

No questions from the public were asked.

Councillor Lanzer left the room prior to the next item and took no part in the discussion.

4. Three Bridges Station Improvement Final Design

The Commission considered report [PES/338](#) of the Head Economy and Planning. The report presented the principles and the design for the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme as set out within the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme Brochure, except in relation to the highways aspect of the scheme, in particular the proposed “No Right Hand Turn” out of the station, which was the responsibility of West Sussex County Council as the Highway Authority to determine. The report requested that West Sussex County Council, as the Highway Authority, makes a clear public decision over ‘the right hand turn out of Three Bridges station’, by 1 July 2020.

In accordance with the above being resolved, the report further requested the approval of further Section 106 funding and delegations dependent on the outcome

The focus of the debate would be on the evidence Cabinet would be considering, which included:

- the outcome of three separate public consultation exercises undertaken on the Three Bridges Station improvement scheme,
- the Petition signed by over a 1000 individuals entitled “No Right Turn - Three Bridges Station Objection’ and presented to and debated by Full Council on 26th February 2020
- the request contained within the Notice of Motion approved by Full Council at its meeting held on 26 February 2020
- all other forecast impacts associated with the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme proposals, as detailed within report.

During the discussion with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development, Head of Economy and Planning and the Station Programme Manager, Members made the following comments:

- Recognition that the report included recommendations following the debate at Full Council on 26 February 2020.
- There was a need to ensure the traffic flow movements were not impinged by the station forecourt improvements, particularly along Haslett Avenue East and Hazelwick Avenue.
- Clarification was sought and provided over the Section 106 funding as these contributions had been collected specifically for Three Bridges Railway Station improvements from the Forge Wood development.
- Support for the partnership working within the project was welcomed, along with the overall benefits the scheme would provide to the station improvement. It was commented that it would be disappointing if the scheme was blemished by one aspect being the “No Right Hand Turn”. It would be important to find a compromise with regards to this aspect which would benefit all involved.
- It was noted that as part of the recommendations, the Cabinet would be requesting that WSCC take the necessary action to identify a viable alternative option for retaining the right hand turn as the Highways Authority by 1 July 2020.
- It was noted that the recommendations were detailed as it was necessary to enable delivery within a timely framework.
- It was requested that Members be kept up to date as to progress and decisions on the discussions with WSCC over the “No Right Hand Turn”.
- The Commission paid tribute to the officers, in particular the Station Programme Manager, for all their hard work, dedication and partnership work they had undertaken in relation to the project.

The Cabinet is advised that the Commission agreed to unanimously support the recommendations and that the Commission's comments be conveyed to the Cabinet.

Councillor Lanzer re-entered the room.

5. New Directions for Crawley

The Commission considered report [PES/341](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning. The 'New Directions for Crawley' document provided issues and options for the Crawley Transport Strategy. It set out a vision for future transport infrastructure and services in Crawley whilst also presenting an outline of proposals for the first phase of delivery towards that vision.

During the discussion the following comments were made:

- There was recognition that the document assisted in highlighting Crawley's priorities which may assist when completing funding applications, particularly through the Crawley Growth Programme (CGP).
- Transport and access had been developed around the town at a time when car ownership was much lower. As the population and the business district grew, more road space had been provided to try to keep pace with the growth.
- Support for the increase in cycling and walking throughout the town, together with trials of pure electric buses, the shift towards full zero emissions bus fleet powered by clean hydrogen or installation of solar farms.
- Air quality was raised as a concern and it was noted that the air quality management zone (AQMA) was potentially to be extended from Hazelwick roundabout towards Three Bridges.
- Acknowledgement that it was an ambitious document and the collaborative partnership approaches with various organisations and groups was welcomed. Particularly given the size of the challenge, which included cost and behaviour change. There may be a need to incentivise the modal shift for example Metrobus trial travel and promote the advantages, making the change easily accessible, free wi-fi on buses and Superhubs.
- It was recognised that there was need to transform transport and access throughout the town, whilst reducing carbon emissions, improving safety, air quality and reducing congestion, it was apparent that in reality public transport will not be appropriate for all residents.
- WSCC had defined a transport strategy and was responding to increased use and developing infrastructure. There was been an increase in the number of electric vehicle charging points following the increase in usage. However it was acknowledged that installation was going to be challenging at some locations for residents.
- Concern was expressed that the further opportunities to work with neighbourhood communities would need to involve active listening and community engagement.

The Cabinet is advised that the Commission agreed to support the report and requested the comments discussed be referred to the Cabinet.

6. Scrutiny Suggestion

A Scrutiny Suggestion had been received covering 'Council-owned neighbourhood parades' from Councillor Lanzer.

The proposed scope was to include the important revenue stream derived from the 11 parades and also their value as community assets in terms of providing local shopping facilities for the neighbourhoods and beyond. The current neighbourhood parade policy was adopted in May 2004 when it was decided to adopt a more commercial approach. With this policy being nearly 16 years old, there was an

opportunity to examine its effectiveness over a considerable period of time and the influence that it has had on meeting the range of objectives associated with the neighbourhood parades.

The desired outcome would be an appraisal of the effectiveness of current neighbourhood parade policies in meeting agreed objectives since May 2004 and consideration of possible changes for the future.

Commission Members noted that given the nature of the questions being raised with the [scrutiny suggestion](#), there was an opportunity to hold a “one off” meeting to scrutinise the information in depth allowing OSC members to be present as all the information specified in the scrutiny suggestion was currently available.

Members discussed the options in detail. Some members commented that the issue was of great public concern and the role of scrutiny was to reflect those issues. A panel would allow a number of issues to be highlighted over a period of time. Others felt that the information was currently available and could be documented in the report.

It was suggested that a one off meeting could be via the Commission which would then focus the scrutiny panel's scoping. All the information proposed within the scrutiny suggestion was currently available and therefore be documented within the report. The option for the scrutiny panel would then progress.

Nominations for the scrutiny panel would be sought via Group Leaders and be included in the AGM paperwork. These would be ratified via OSC in June.

It was moved by Councillor Burrett (seconded by Councillor Pendlington) that a scrutiny panel be established for the municipal year 2020-2021 with the first OSC meeting as the scoping meeting with a report outlining the detailed requirements from the scrutiny suggestion. It was agreed that Councillor Lanzer act as the liaison in the interim period. The amendment, upon being put to the Commission, was declared to be Carried.

RESOLVED

1. That the Overview and Scrutiny Commission approves the topic for a scrutiny review to be established for the new municipal year, pending the first meeting of the municipal year (scoping meeting).
2. That the Commission receives a full report at a meeting (planned for the first in the municipal year) as the scoping session.
3. Seek nominations (via Democratic Services) for the membership for the Panel, in accordance with political proportionality.
4. That a Chair for the new scrutiny panel be established.
5. That Councillor Lanzer act as the liaison in the interim period.

7. Exempt Information – Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED

That in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds

that it involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified against the item.

8. Town Hall Site Redevelopment: Revised Budget for the District Heat Network

Exempt Paragraph 3 & 5

Information relating to financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information)

Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

The Commission considered report DCE/05 of the Deputy Chief Executive. In finalising the design of the District Heat Network (DHN) and prior to appointing a contractor for the scheme it has become necessary to make budget changes for the DHN. The purpose of this report therefore provide background, to set out the variations scheme and to seek agreement on the way forward that avoids increasing the overall budget for the Town Hall Site Redevelopment project.

During the discussion with the Deputy Chief Executive, the following comments were made:

- Confirmation that the District Heat Network would provide heating and electricity to the buildings included within the wider Town Hall re-development, and other developments within Crawley Town Centre.
- Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (Policy ENV7) highlighted the site as a priority area for the delivery of District Energy Network as identified on the Local Plan Map.
- Confirmation that the Town Hall Working Group had received updates at key stages within the project, with the last such being opened up as an all-member seminar prior to the signing of the contract with Keir to build the new Town Hall.
- Confirmation that the risk register was regularly reviewed and was included on the Audit Committee agenda. The risk register had recently been reformatted and updated to reflect the move to the next stage of the new Town Hall project.
- Confirmation sought and provided on the financial implications and future arrangements.
- Acknowledgement of the design changes, budget allocations and rationale.
- Clarification was sought over the global budget. The Commission indicated its support for option 3 within the report. There was further support for the addition of discreet progress and expenditure tracking against the DHN within that area.

The Cabinet is advised that the Commission:

1. Indicated its broad support in principle for the report.
2. Unanimously supported option 3 within section 6 of the report, with the addition of discreet progress and expenditure tracking against the DHN within that area.

Re-Admission of the Public

The Chair declared the meeting reopen for consideration of business in public session.

9. Forward Plan - and Provisional List of Reports for the Commission's following Meetings

This was the Commission's last meeting of the municipal year. It was anticipated the Commission would consider early next year:

- Treasury Management Outturn 2019-2020
- Budget Strategy 2021/22 – 2025/26

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.45pm.

T Rana (Chair)

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Tuesday, 10 March 2020 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

S Malik (Chair)

A Belben, J Hart, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, G S Jhans, J Purdy and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Jean McPherson	Group Manager (Development Management)
Clem Smith	Head of Economy and Planning
Hamish Walke	Principal Planning Officer
Jess Tamplin	Democratic Services Support Officer
Paula Slinn	Legal Advisor

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor M Mwagale

Absent:

Councillors T McAleney and L M Ascough

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Lobbying Declarations

The following lobbying declarations were made by Councillors:

All Councillors in attendance had been lobbied regarding application CR/2019/0739/TPO.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 February 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. **Planning Application CR/2019/0542/FUL - Moka, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley**

The Committee considered report [PES/330a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Demolition of existing nightclub and redevelopment of site providing 152 apartments, ground floor commercial/retail space (class A1, A3, A4, B1 and/or D2 uses) split between 2 to 4 units, new publicly accessible public realm (including pocket park), new publicly accessible electric vehicle charging hub, car club and associated works.

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P C Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer provided an update on the application. The Committee was reminded that in December 2019, the application was permitted subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, but an amendment to the Agreement was now necessary. The application had made reference to securing a car club as part of the proposed development, with Bluecity as the intended operator. The Committee was informed that Bluecity had ceased operating in the UK in February 2020. A minor amendment was therefore sought to provide the applicant with flexibility in seeking a new car club operator.

The Committee then considered the application.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the conclusion of the Section 106 Agreement as set out in report [PES/330a](#), and the conditions set out in report [PES/327a](#) including the amended conditions and revised recommendation.

5. **Planning Application CR/2019/0739/TPO - St Nicholas Church, Church Road, Pound Hill, Crawley**

The Committee considered report [PES/330b](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Lime T2 - fell, lime T3 - fell, lime T4 - fell, lime T5 - fell, turkey oak T6 - fell, lime T7 - fell, wych elm T8 - fell, turkey oak T9 - fell, lime T10 - fell, lime T12 – fell and replace with 12 no. Glastonbury thorns as per drg no. P2179 – 014 (amended description).

Councillors A Belben, Irvine, Jaggard, Purdy, and P C Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application which proposed the felling of ten trees lining the path to St Nicholas' Church and the planting of 12 replacement trees. It was heard that the path was the sole access to the church and the maturity of the trees had caused buckling to the path's surface and encroachment on the width of the path, which could restrict access for some visitors and cause a trip hazard. Alternatives, such as the resurfacing of the path and the cutting back of the trees, had been considered and were deemed unfeasible. The Officer's report concluded that the short-term loss of visual amenity from the felling of the trees and the re-planting was considered acceptable on balance. A further objection had been received since the report was prepared which

put forward a new comment relating to the trees' role as carbon sinks and Crawley's poor atmospheric pollution levels. The comments of an objector who was unable to address the Committee were also summarised.

David Hathaway spoke in objection to the application. Various proposals were suggested, such as the re-routing of the footpath or the felling of fewer trees, and it was said that a compromise should be sought between environmental needs and sufficient access for those with disabilities.

The Committee then considered the application. A range of matters were raised as part of a detailed discussion. Views expressed included:

- The potential for the trees to provide amenity for a further 20-40 years.
- The substantial damage to the path had been a slow process over the trees' long existence and any further damage caused in the rest of the trees' lifetime may be comparatively minor.
- The appropriate setting of the trees as part of Worth Conservation Area.
- Acknowledgement of the importance of access to the church for all visitors.
- The trees' contribution to local air quality and Crawley Borough Council's recent declaration of a climate emergency.
- The visual amenity, prominence, and residents' attachment to the trees.
- The unsuitability of Glastonbury thorns as a replacement species, which Officers suggested could be reconsidered.
- The possibility of removing fewer trees – either alternate trees or those along one side of the path – although the 'avenue' effect would not be maintained.
- A request that the churchyard's below-ground archaeology and graves be undisturbed by both the proposed removal and planting of trees, to which Officers provided reassurance.

Councillor Irvine requested that a recorded vote, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 25.5, be taken on the recommendation to consent and the conditions set out in report [PES/330b](#). The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to consent:

None.

Against the recommendation to consent:

Councillors A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, Purdy, and P C Smith (8).

Abstentions:

None.

The Officer's recommendation to consent was overturned.

It was then moved to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

The trees have amenity value and make a positive contribution to the approach to and setting of the church, the conservation area and Crawley's environment. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the scheme for the proposed removal of all the trees is justified or that all alternatives have been fully explored.

The Chair sought a recorded vote on the new recommendation to refuse, which was taken and is recorded as set out below:

For the new recommendation to refuse:

Councillors A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, Purdy, and P C Smith (8).

Against the new recommendation to refuse:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Refuse for the following reason:

The trees have amenity value and make a positive contribution to the approach to and setting of the church, the conservation area and Crawley's environment. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the scheme for the proposed removal of all the trees is justified or that all alternatives have been fully explored.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.35 pm

**S Malik
(Chair)**

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Cabinet

Wednesday, 11 March 2020 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

P K Lamb (Chair)	Leader of the Council
I T Irvine	Cabinet Member for Housing
G S Jhans	Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability
C J Mullins	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
P C Smith	Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development and Deputy Leader

Also in Attendance:

Councillor D Crow, R D Burrett and T Rana

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Ann-Maria Brown	Head of Legal, Democracy and HR
Ian Duke	Deputy Chief Executive
Chris Pedlow	Democratic Services Manager
Allan Hambly	Communication Manager
Patricia Salami	Station Programme Manager
Louise Skipton-Carter	Sustainability Manager

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor B A Smith

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Public Question Time

The Cabinet received a question from Mr Symonds of Ifield, in relation to Homes England refusing a Freedom of Information request to release results of a Wildlife and Traffic Survey affecting Crawley and that in their refusal Homes England commented

"Is Homes England correct in stating that releasing these results now could [to quote]: 'prejudice...Crawley Borough Council's statutory role as Local Authority' and [to quote]: 'jeopardise the ability of...the Local Council to respond...and put the allocation in a Local Plan at risk?'" Is that statement the case, Mr Symonds asked?

Councillor P Smith responded, commenting that the FOI to Homes England appears from an Ifield West resident, and from what he has seen looks like a valid set of questions to seek a response to. However, we, as Crawley Borough Council, cannot comment on the responses provided by another public body, such as Homes England, as it would be totally inappropriate to do so, because we as the Council we are not privy to all the information and data Homes England has on this matter or to the whole of the Freedom of Information (FOI) request, just an extract.

Councillor Irvine also responded to the question stating, that he noted there was a right to appeal the FOI decision, not to respond, and he wished the resident well if he chooses that course of action.

3. Matters referred to the Cabinet and Report from the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission

It was confirmed that no matters had been referred to the Cabinet for further consideration.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5 February 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

5. Further Notice of Intention to Conduct Business in Private and Notifications of any Representations

The Head of Legal, Democracy and HR reported that no representations had been received in respect of agenda items 13 and 14: *Town Hall Site Redevelopment: Revised Budget for the District Heat Network and Print Procurement Contract*, respectively.

6. Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme - Next Steps

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development presented report [PES/338](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning. In presenting the report to the Cabinet, they were reminded that there had been a Petition, submitted on this issue and a debate on the Petition along with a Notice of Motion at Full Council held on 26 February 2020. As a result, the Cabinet must have due regard to the petition and the views expressed during the debates on Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme and issue of the 'No Right-Hand Turn' when considering the recommendations before them.

Councillor P Smith stated that this whole project of Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme was essentially a forecourt project with a highway's element. Crawley Borough Council (CBC) was the lead authority for the project, including responsibility for the programme management activities as part of the Crawley Growth

Programme. The whole project was in partnership with West Sussex CC Highways, Coast 2 Capital LEP, Network Rail, Metrobus, GTR, and the Council.

Whilst CBC was the lead authority, it was not responsible for every aspect of the project, with each of the partners still retaining their decision making for each area of their own responsibility. WSCC Highways, retained the responsibility for the highway's elements of the design and CBC had to follow their advice and decisions and incorporate them into the final overall design.

The Cabinet were reminded that the Council had consulted as extensively and reasonably as possible on all our planning and economic development projects since 2014, and it was right to do, as our residents were our customers and we need to listen to them as the users of the projects we will be delivering. On Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme, CBC, as the lead partner for the scheme, had gone out of our way to consult with all interested groups, including the taxi drivers (part of whose livelihood can depend on Three Bridges station), as well as Metrobus, the Town Access Group, the Walking and Cycling Forum and others but most importantly the public. Three extensive consultations were run, involving brochures, FAQs, traffic modelling, and all of this was on a dedicated website for the project. Every question that has been asked was on the website, even those questions that we haven't been able to provide a satisfactory answer. Throughout the project the team have listened to and considered every single possibility including putting the eastern access from Station Hill into the project as that was a direct result of consultation, in particular with Maidenbower Ward Councillors. It was not in the original scope and would cost significantly more, but it was recognised that it is a good idea and something that would improve the options for our residents and users over how they will travel to and from the station. It was noted that at the request of the Maidenbower Councillors, further traffic modelling was done. This showed it was not an option to put in a pick-up and drop-off point on Station Hill, as it had a negative impact on traffic flow and also on the cost. These are two examples demonstrating how the CBC lead project team had taken suggestions on board and investigated them further.

It was noted that the improvement scheme had two elements – the forecourt element and the highways element. As a forerunner to this scheme the traffic lights were changed by WSCC as part of the Crawley Growth Programme, and the Cycleway schemes were installed on Station Hill and Worth Park Avenue, which were part of a wider programme of work driven by improving sustainable transport options. The highways element includes provisions that will allow people to cross the road safely and walk or cycle under the bridge, which currently was not technically safe to do.

Cabinet Members were informed that the Crawley Growth Programme has recognised the major importance of WSCC and CBC working together with project teams with Cabinet members from both Councils meeting regularly and listening to each other – it's about having an excellent working relationship despite any political differences. It has been positively approached by all and was for the benefit of our joint community, as they were the people who own Three Bridges station - we just have the privilege of improving it for them. As a result of this positive relationship, we have worked with experts, technicians, contractors, traffic engineers, etc. We can confidently say we have exhausted all possibilities on the right turn. Everybody involved would ideally like to retain the right turn. It's something that was good for a small number of people. But we've looked in detail at 12 options for the design, with WSCC Highways looking at the traffic modelling, and have not found a solution that will work to retain the right turn.

Councillor P Smith commented that going forward all 36 CBC Councillors and the 9 Crawley WSCC Councillors need to look at this scheme as a town wide initiative to

improve a major station in the town. This is for the benefit of the average of 8000 people that use the station every day, including those arriving by car, bus or rail from elsewhere for work, pedestrians, cyclists, and those with children and access difficulties. Peak traffic volume is 3000 vehicles per hour moving east and west, with 128 of those turning right. This is typical of all periods of the year except at Christmas and for a time during the school summer holidays. This represents 4% of movements through the space using the right turn, during the morning peak it's 2% turning right.

It was recognised that some journeys may take longer. They probably won't take as long as people are worried they will. But it would benefit everyone else by reducing all other journey times. As a project lead CBC have done our best to listen to residents, local groups, Councillors, and those who have communicated with the project team. We've come up with a scheme that meets the majority of requirements, and it's a shame that some may have longer journeys, but nobody was being prevented from accessing the station - they just might have to consider taking an alternative route.

In concluding of presenting the report, Councillor Smith informed the Cabinet that the recommendations were to ask West Sussex CC highways to have a further look at the scheme and confirm if there were or not any other options, and decide how to proceed after that. He commented that he hoped his detailed presentation of the report covers all the issues that the petitioners raised, and those matters Councillors mentioned during an interesting debate at the last meeting of the Full Council.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 9 March 2020. In doing so she read out the Commission comments as detailed in report [OSC/286](#), which was provided to the Cabinet, in doing so she emphasised that the Commission agreed to unanimously support the recommendations. The Commission also confirmed that they felt the report provided an extraordinary amount of detail on the project and thanked the officers for their hard work on the Three Bridges Station project.

Councillors Lamb, Mullins and Irvine all spoke as part of the in-depth discussion on the report and in support of the scheme. A question was raised during the debate as to whether the Cabinet request of a public response from West Sussex CC would be obtainable by the deadline on 1 July.

The Leader of the Council invited Councillor Crow, who indicated that he would like to speak on this item and in doing so Councillor Crow commented that with his knowledge of West Sussex CC, he was quite sure that the decision would be delegated to an officer with expert knowledge of traffic management to make the decision over whether a right hand turn would be possible. Also he would be quite confident that the County Council would be able to respond to the Cabinet's request by the 1 July. The Leader thanked Councillor Crow for his assistance.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet having confirmed that it has considered

- the outcome of three separate public consultation exercises undertaken on the Three Bridges Station improvement scheme,
- the Petition signed by 1000 individuals entitled "No Right Turn - Three Bridges Station Objection" and presented to and debated by Full Council on 26th February 2020

- the request contained within the Notice of Motion approved by Full Council at its meeting held on 26 February 2020
- all other forecast impacts associated with the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme proposals, as detailed within report,

agrees to:

- a) approve the principles and the design for the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme as set out within the [Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme Brochure](#) except in relation to the highways aspect of the scheme, in particular the proposed “No Right Hand Turn” out of the station, which is the responsibility of West Sussex County Council as the Highway Authority to determine.
- b) pass responsibility for determining a decision on the “No Right Hand Turn” to West Sussex County Council as Highways Authority and in doing so requesting that the Highway Authority take the necessary action to identify a viable alternative option for retaining the right hand turn as requested by the above petition. If no viable option for maintaining the right hand turn out of the station can be identified, then West Sussex County Council are asked to confirm this.
- c) request that West Sussex County Council, as the Highway Authority, makes a **clear public decision** over ‘the right hand turn out of Three Bridges station’, **by 1 July 2020**. Including within that **public decision**:
 - whether to continue with the Scheme in its current recommended design **or** to provide an alternative scheme design to retain the right hand turn out of Three Bridges station, based on either a viable modified version of the previously considered Option 3 as detailed in the Traffic Modelling Summary dated January 2020, **or** on similar viable alternatives **and**
 - confirm that if an alternative scheme becomes the preferred option that further public consultation would take place before West Sussex County Council approves the final scheme.
- d) confirm that if a clear public decision is not made by **1 July 2020** then Crawley Borough Council, as the lead partner for the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme, on behalf of the Crawley Growth Programme, will presume that, the current recommended design option contained within the [Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme Brochure](#) with **no right turn** is the Highway Authority’s approved option and as such **will** continue with this scheme, which is part of the Crawley Growth Programme as agreed with West Sussex County Council and the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership.
- e) confirm it will support the ultimate decision taken by West Sussex County Council over the right hand turn, e.g. continue with the scheme design in its current recommended format or select an alternative scheme design, retaining the right hand turn, which would be developed by West Sussex County Council (Highway Authority), subject to a further public consultation exercise.
- f) confirm that in accordance with the above being resolved, to:
 - i) approves the addition of £89,000 of Section 106 monies to the Three Bridges Station Improvement scheme, which is part of the Crawley Growth Programme.

- ii) delegates authority to the Head of Economy and Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development to submit a planning application for the final scheme and undertake, subject to planning permission, a procurement exercise for the scheme, in accordance with the Council's Procurement Code, to recommend a suitable contractor with the appointment of the contractor requiring Cabinet approval.
 - iii) delegates the negotiation and approval of the terms of all relevant legal documentation to the Head of Economy and Planning, Head of Legal, Democracy and HR and Head of Corporate Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development. (*Generic delegation 2 and 3 will be used to enact this recommendation*).
- g) note that all matters relating to the designs for the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme are subject to planning permission being granted.

Reasons for the Recommendations

The proposed scheme seeks to support the following aims of the Crawley Growth Programme, of which the Three Bridges Station Improvement Scheme is part

- Improve significantly the quality of sustainable transport infrastructure (bus, cycle routes and pedestrian walkways) and
- Achieve major bus, cycle and pedestrian connectivity enhancements at 3 of Crawley's 4 railway stations – Crawley, Gatwick and Three Bridges.

The scheme will deliver this by creating a brand new station entrance off Station Hill and improving pedestrian, bus user and cyclist access into and exiting from the station, transforming the station forecourt public realm and strengthening sustainable transport connections to benefit both local residents and commuters to Manor Royal and all parts of Crawley. It will also provide dedicated and upgraded taxi waiting and public drop off / pick up zones.

The recommendations take into account the full debate by Members on the petition and the debate on the Council motion that took place at Full Council on the 26 February, which are explained in detail in section 5 of this report.

West Sussex County Council is asked to make a public decision as described in 2.2b and c above by 1 July 2020 at the latest to ensure that the Three Bridges Station improvement scheme can then progress in accordance with the Crawley Growth Programme delivery timeline agreed with the Local Enterprise Partnership.

7. New Directions for Crawley (issues and options for Crawley Transport Strategy)

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development presented report [PES/341](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning, which set out the proposed "New Directions for Crawley", a Crawley Transport Strategy issues and options document ([Appendix A](#)). It set out a vision for future transport infrastructure and services in Crawley whilst also presenting an outline of proposals for the first phase of delivery towards that vision. It was noted that draft Crawley Transport Strategy issues and

options document had been out for public consultation exercise which concluded on 17th February 2020. The report also details the changes proposed arising from the consultation process.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 9 March, which confirmed the Commission's support of the strategy.

Councillors Mullins, Jhans and Irvine spoke as part of the discussion on the report.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet approves the adoption of "New Directions for Crawley" the Crawley Transport Strategy issues and options document ([Appendix A](#)) to report [PES/341](#).

Reasons for the Recommendations

The previously approved draft Crawley Transport Strategy issues and options document has been amended following consultation. The feedback has been largely very positive with suggestions that have informed proposed relatively minor additions and changes to the document. Approval of this draft as the final document is sought.

8. Allocating Monies Collected Through CIL 2020/21

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development presented report [PES/335](#) of the Head of Economy & Planning which set out the findings of the Annual review of Crawley's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Programme. The report detailed the proposed CIL strategic infrastructure spend priorities to the end of March 2023, as well as an update on the second year of the pilot scheme for crowdfunding - Crowdfund Crawley.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet

- a) approves the proposed CIL strategic infrastructure spend priorities presented in the Infrastructure Business Plan at (Appendix A of report [PES/335](#)) and set out in section 7, to March 2023.
- b) notes that the Infrastructure Business Plan, including the funding programme, will continue to be reviewed on an annual basis to take into account any changes in strategic infrastructure priorities and fluctuations in CIL receipts compared to the forecast. The next review is proposed to take place in March 2021.
- c) approves extending the Crowdfund Crawley pilot scheme until the end of March 2021 and for the scheme to be reviewed again in March 2021.

Reasons for the Recommendations

By approving the revised CIL Infrastructure Business Plan, it will give clarity to the projects identified as a priority for delivery using CIL finances and it will also provide a clear audit trail.

The extension of the Crowdfund Crawley programme will allow the Council to continue to assess the impact that the programme has had to date.

9. Council's Nomination to Crawley Town Centre BID Board

The Leader of the Council present report PES/347 by the Head of Economy and Planning, which sought a nomination from the Council, for a Councillor to join the soon to be established Town Centre BID Board, following the successful ballot in November 2019.

It was noted that external advice has been obtained confirming that there was no issue with an individual sitting on more than one BID Board.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet nominates the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development as the Council's representative to the Town Centre BID Board, and the Portfolio Responsibilities be amended to include this appointment within the Constitution.

10. Exempt Information – Exclusion of the Public (Subject to Agenda Item 5)

RESOLVED

That in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified against the item.

11. Town Hall Site Redevelopment: Revised Budget for the District Heat Network

Exempt Paragraphs 3 & 5

The Leader of the Council presented report, DCE/05 of the Deputy Chief Executive. The purpose of the report was to set out the changes to the District Heat Network scheme that have created the additional cost and to seek agreement on the way forward that avoids increasing the overall budget for the Town Hall Site Redevelopment project.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 9 March 2020, which included that the Commission had given its broad support in principle for the report. Also that the Commission unanimously supported option 3

within section 6 of the report DCE/05, with the addition of discreet progress and expenditure tracking against the DHN within that area.

Councillor Irvine spoke on the report.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet

- a) notes the recent design changes to the design of the District Heat Network (DHN), the cost implications and the underlying reasons for this
- b) notes the level of expenditure incurred to date on the DHN project
- c) agrees the continuation of the DHN project, subject to Full Council agreement that the budget allocations for the Town Hall Site Redevelopment can henceforth be treated as a global budget
- d) agrees for officers to pursue recompense for erroneous advice received should investigations reveal that course of action to be appropriate

That Full Council be recommended to:

- a) Note that the budget for the New Town Hall contract contains a high level of contingency
- b) Agree that the budget allocations for the Town Hall Site Redevelopment can henceforth be treated as a global budget under the delegations to the Deputy Chief Executive as agreed by Full Council in the February 2017.

Reasons for the Recommendations

In February 2017, the Council agreed the deliverables of the Town Hall Site Redevelopment, the budget lines to achieve this, and the delegated powers to develop and proceed with the development (set out in more detail in Section 4 of report DCE/05). In December 2018, the Council agreed to amend the budget for the District Heat Network, taking account of the benefits of the scheme (also set out in Section 4 of report DCE/05)). The recommendations above will allow both schemes to proceed without impacting on the combined budgets previously agreed.

Whilst it could be argued that given no further funding is being sought, there are sufficient delegations already in place to treat the individual budgets as a global figure, and to use the quarterly finance monitoring to vire funding; it is also arguable that this would not be sufficiently transparent for a project of this type and profile. Furthermore, it is appropriate to set out any changes to the rate of return anticipated from this investment given that these will have changed since the December 2018 report.

12. Print Procurement Contract

Exempt Paragraph 3

The Leader of the Council presented report CEX/50 of the Chief Executive which set out the result of the joint tendering exercise and evaluation for printed material such as leaflets, brochures, envelopes etc. The procurement was a joint exercise with Horsham DC, Mid Sussex DC and Mole Valley DC.

It was noted that the report also proposed the creation of a dynamic purchasing system (DPS) and that all contracts including the DPS to commence from 1 April 2020 for a three-year term, with a one-year optional extension period, subject to the suppliers' satisfactory performance.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet approves

- a) the appointment of the following providers for the work indicated below for a period of three years from 1 April 2020 (with the option to extend for a further one year):

General print work – low volumes (lot 1a)

- Bidder 10
- Bidder 11
- Bidder 28
- Bidder 14

General print work – high volumes (lot 1b)

- Bidder 27
- Bidder 9
- Bidder 24
- Bidder 15

General signage (lot 2)

- Bidder 30
- Bidder 32
- Bidder 5

Envelopes (lot 3)

- Bidder 8
- Bidder 25

- b) the creation of a Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) for the work indicated below for a period of three years from 1 April 2020 (with the option to extend for a further one year):

- Specialised print work (lot A)
- Banners (lot B)
- Design services (lot C)
- Mailing (lot D)
- Electoral Printing (lot E)

Reasons for the Recommendations

Following a tender exercise and evaluation, the providers identified in paragraph 2.2 of report CEX/50 have submitted the most economically advantageous tenders in four lots.

The creation of a DPS will allow the councils to invite quotes on jobs within five lots and obtain best value.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Cabinet concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.04 pm

P K LAMB
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Monday, 27 April 2020 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

S Malik (Chair)

T McAleney (Vice-Chair)

L M Ascough, A Belben, J Hart, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, G S Jhans, J Purdy and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Ann-Maria Brown Head of Legal, Democracy and HR

Jean McPherson Group Manager (Development Management)

Chris Pedlow Democratic Services Manager

Clem Smith Head of Economy and Planning

Jess Tamplin Democratic Services Support Officer

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor M Mwagale

1. Introduction by the Monitoring Officer/Head of Legal, Democracy and HR

The Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal, Democracy and HR provided the Committee with a summary of the Council's new Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. It was noted that at this meeting, a recorded vote would be taken on each item on the agenda.

2. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

3. Lobbying Declarations

No lobbying declarations were made.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 March 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5. Planning Application CR/2019/0904/TPO - Amenity Land to the Front of 99/101 Worth Road, Pound Hill, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/332a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Acer – crown radius reduction of up to 1.5m and reduction in height by up to 0.75m to appropriate growth points.

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application. The proposed maintenance works had been publicised through a site notice and letters to nearby neighbours and no responses had been received. The tree was a mature specimen, but the works would not be detrimental to the health of the tree.

The Committee then considered the application.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to consent:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Consent subject to conditions set out in report [PES/332a](#).

6. Planning Application CR/2019/0906/TPO - Amenity Land to the Front of 105/107 Worth Road, Pound Hill, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/332b](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Robinia – reduce height and crown radius by 1.5m. Remove epicormic growth up to crown break.

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application. The proposed maintenance works had been publicised through a site notice and letters to nearby neighbours and no responses had been received.

The Committee then considered the application.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to consent:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Consent subject to conditions set out in report [PES/332b](#).

7. Planning Application CR/2019/0907/TPO - Amenity Land to the Front of 51/53 Worth Road, Pound Hill, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/332c](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Robinia – clear holly/yew from around base. Crown radius reduction of up to 2m and reduction in height by up to 1m to appropriate growth points. Removal of basal/epicormic growth.

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application. The proposed maintenance works had been publicised through a site notice and letters to nearby neighbours and no responses had been received. The trees to be removed around the base of the trunk of the robinia were not protected by any Tree Preservation Orders.

The Committee then considered the application. Clarification was sought that the removal of the smaller trees would not damage the roots of the robinia tree.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to consent:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Consent subject to conditions set out in report [PES/332c](#).

8. Planning Application CR/2019/0908/TPO - Amenity Land to the Front of 57/59 Worth Road, Pound Hill, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/332d](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Robinia – crown reduction – reduce from footpath/road/street lamp by 1.5/2m to appropriate growth points/rebalance crown. Removal of basal/epicormics growth.

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application. The proposed maintenance works had been publicised through a site notice and letters to nearby neighbours and no responses had been received.

The Committee then considered the application.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to consent:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Consent subject to conditions set out in report [PES/332d](#).

9. Planning Application CR/2019/0911/TPO - Amenity Land to the Front of 63/65 Worth Road, Pound Hill, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/332e](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Robinia – reduce crown radius by up to of 2m and crown height by up to 1m to appropriate growth points. Removal of basal/epicormic growth.

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application and updated the Committee that a minor change to the wording of the proposal had been made, to read 'Robinia – reduce crown radius by 1.5m to 2m and crown height by up to 1m to appropriate growth points. Removal of basal/epicormic growth'. The proposed maintenance works had been publicised through a site notice and letters to nearby neighbours and no responses had been received.

The Committee then considered the application. In response to a question from a Committee member, it was confirmed that the specimen was regarded as a single five-stemmed tree and the recommended tree works were considered on this basis, rather than as five individual specimens.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to consent:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Consent in line with the amended wording of the proposal, and subject to conditions set out in report [PES/332e](#).

10. Planning Application CR/2019/0912/TPO - Amenity Land to the Front of 75/77 Worth Road, Pound Hill, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/332f](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Robinia – crown lift by 2m. Reduce crown radius by up to of 2m and reduce crown height by up to 1m to appropriate growth points.

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application and updated the Committee that a minor change to the wording of the proposal had been made, to read 'Robinia – crown lift by 2m. Reduce crown radius by 1.5m to 2m and reduce crown height by up to 1m to appropriate growth points'. The proposed maintenance works had been publicised through a site notice and letters to nearby neighbours and no responses had been received.

The Committee then considered the application. In response to a question from a Committee member, it was confirmed that the subject of the application was the tree in the centre of the photograph in the report, rather than the tree at the right of the

photograph. Maintenance was necessary to distance the branches from nearby telephone cables.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to consent:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Consent in line with the amended wording of the proposal, and subject to conditions set out in report [PES/332f](#).

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.42 pm

S Malik
(Chair)

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Monday, 8 June 2020 at 7.18 pm

Councillors Present:

T Rana (Chair)

T G Belben (Vice-Chair)

M L Ayling, R G Burgess, R D Burrett, R S Fiveash, J Hart, R A Lanzer, A Pendlington and K Sudan

Also in Attendance:

Councillor P K Lamb and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Sue Bader

Asset Manager

Natalie Brahma-Pearl

Chief Executive

Heather Girling

Democratic Services Officer

Karen Hayes

Head of Corporate Finance

Chris Pedlow

Democratic Services Manager

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor T McAleney

1. Disclosures of Interest and Whipping Declarations

No disclosures or whipping of interests were made.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 9 March 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. Public Question Time

No questions from the public were received.

4. Appointments and Establishment of Scrutiny Panels (Continuation of Membership)

RESOLVED

That the Commission noted and approved the continuation of following memberships and appointments:

Climate Change Scrutiny Panel

Councillors R S Fiveash, J Hart, K L Jaggard, T Lunnon and A Pendlington, with Councillor K L Jaggard as Chair.

West Sussex Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee (HASC)

Councillor McAleney

West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Steering Group (JSSG)

Councillor Rana

5. Council-owned Neighbourhood Parades - Introductory Report

Following the submission of a [Scrutiny Suggestion Form](#) by Councillor Lanzer, the report updated Councillors on the number, nature and examination of the various roles of council-owned neighbourhood parades and explored how effectively these were currently being discharged, together with what improvements might be made for the future.

The current neighbourhood parade policy ([Property Strategy](#)) was adopted in May 2004 when it was decided to adopt a more commercial approach. There was an opportunity to examine its effectiveness over a considerable period of time and the influence that it has had on meeting the range of objectives associated with the neighbourhood parades.

The first Overview and Scrutiny Commission (OSC) meeting was identified as the meeting to receive a detailed report ([FIN/499](#)) outlining the requirements from the scrutiny suggestion and to reconfirm whether there was value and a further need for the Scrutiny Panel.

During the discussion with the Head of Corporate Finance and Asset Manager, Members thanked the officers for a detailed and interesting report, which covered the areas addressed within the scrutiny suggestion form's aim, objective and scope. During the discussion the following comments were made which may be beneficial for a Panel to address further should one be established:

- It was noted that the Council had an important role in the parades to support community assets.
- There was a good range of shops within the parades and this needed to be maintained.
- The increased population and lifestyle choices have an impact on the change of use, such as there were more food takeaways and beauty therapists on the parades than had been previously.
- It was acknowledged there were challenges, both in the past and particularly now with Covid19. It would be interesting to establish whether patterns of use had changed during the pandemic and whether this was pattern was likely to remain.

It was remarked that during this time more people had been shopping locally and the role these local shops play needed to remain, particularly given the impact on the carbon footprint.

- Consultation would be important should a Panel proceed although it was noted this would be difficult given the current situation. It would be valuable to find out what residents want from the parades and also include letting agents and some tenants.
- It was acknowledged that a landlord can, acting reasonably, decline to agree that a lease be assigned (sold on) to an assignee. However the basic principle was that the assignee must put the Council as landlord in no worse position than the Council would be with the existing tenant.
- The regeneration works had resulted in much improvement to the parades and the cost had been borne by the Council.
- It was queried whether miscellaneous units should be included into appendix A and whether this could be accommodated by a Panel if established when looking at any rent analysis.
- It was noted that some retail units had flats over, where the Council required that the flat was taken on a commercial lease with the shop. There were two parades where all the flats above the shops were Crawley Homes units.
- Further clarification was sought regarding the different retail uses within the Local Plan, together with those units on specific parades listed in the appendices.
- In terms of vacant units, it was important to find a balance between use and rent. It was important that the use needed to compliment the others on the parades.
- Should a Panel be established the aim, objective and scope to examine the Property Strategy in further detail may produce newer and improved ways for the policy to operate.

Following a lengthy and detailed discussion, the Commission considered the value and requirement for the Scrutiny Panel given the detailed report before them. It was proposed by Councillor Rana and seconded by Councillor T Belben to reconfirm the establishment of the Council-owned Neighbourhood Parades Scrutiny Panel.

Re-Establishment of Scrutiny Panel

The Chair invited the Democratic Services Manager to commence the recorded voting process in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against recommendation 2.1a were recorded as set out below:

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, T G Belben, R G Burgess, Burrett, Fiveash, Hart, Lanzer, Pendlington, Rana, Sudan (10)

Voting Against: Councillors: None (0)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

The recommendation was declared as carried – votes in favour 10, votes against 0, with 0 abstention.

RESOLVED

That the Commission reconfirmed the establishment of the Council-owned Neighbourhood Parades Scrutiny Panel.

Membership of Scrutiny Panel

Nominations had been received for the Council-owned Neighbourhood Parades Scrutiny Panel.

It was moved by Councillor Rana, seconded by Councillor T Belben that the Scrutiny Panel be 3:2 split with the following members: Councillors M L Ayling, R S Fiveash, F Guidera, R A Lanzer and T Lunnon, with Councillor Lanzer as Chair and that the Commission's comments would be collated for the first meeting of the Scrutiny Panel which would agree the Scoping Framework.

Following this Councillor Ayling, seconded by Councillor Rana, proposed the appointment of Councillor Ayling as Chair.

The Chair invited the Democratic Services Manager to commence the recorded voting process in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against recommendation 2.1b were recorded as set out below:

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, T G Belben, R G Burgess, Burrett, Fiveash, Hart, Lanzer, Pendlington, Rana, Sudan (10)

Voting Against: Councillors: None (0)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

The recommendation was declared as carried – votes in favour 10, votes against 0, with 0 abstention.

RESOLVED

That the Commission confirmed the establishment of the Council-owned Neighbourhood Parades Scrutiny Panel based on a 3:2 membership of Councillors M L Ayling, R S Fiveash, F Guidera, R A Lanzer and T Lunnon.

Chair of Scrutiny Panel

The Chair invited the Democratic Services Manager to commence the recorded voting process in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against recommendation 2.1c were recorded as set out below:

Voting in Favour of Councillor Ayling: Councillors: Ayling, Fiveash, Hart, Rana, Sudan (5)

Voting in Favour of Councillor Lanzer: Councillors: T G Belben, R G Burgess, Burrett, Lanzer, Pendlington (5)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

As a result the Chair had to use their casting vote and it was,

RESOLVED

Councillor Ayling was appointed as Chair of the Council-owned Neighbourhood Parades Scrutiny Panel.

6. Scrutiny Workshop

The Scrutiny Workshop was provisionally proposed for Wednesday 17 June. However with scrutiny panels already in place and given the current situation it was agreed to cancel the workshop.

7. Forward Plan - and Provisional List of Reports for the Commission's following Meetings

The Commission confirmed the following reports:

22 June 2020

- Treasury Management Outturn 2019 – 2020
- Financial Outturn 2019-2020 (Quarter 4)
- Forward Programme of Key Procurements
- Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
- EV Charging and Infrastructure Network

(Should OSC Members wish to refer any future items, please email democratic.services@ Crawley.gov.uk)

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.28 pm

**T Rana
(Chair)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Monday, 22 June 2020 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

T Rana (Chair)

T G Belben (Vice-Chair)

M L Ayling, R G Burgess, R D Burrett, R S Fiveash, J Hart, R A Lanzer, T McAleney,
A Pendlington and K Sudan

Also in Attendance:

Councillor G S Jhans

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Heather Girling	Democratic Services Officer
Karen Hayes	Head of Corporate Finance
Jo Newton-Smith	Procurement Manager
Chris Pedlow	Democratic Services Manager
Louise Skipton-Carter	Sustainability Manager
Clem Smith	Head of Economy and Planning
Paul Windust	Chief Accountant

1. Disclosures of Interest and Whipping Declarations

The following disclosures were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor R D Burrett	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 7)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 7)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 7)	Personal Interest – WSCC Cabinet Member Economy and Corporate Resources
Councillor K Sudan	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 7)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R D Burrett	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – WSCC Cabinet Member Economy and Corporate Resources
Councillor K Sudan	EV Charging Infrastructure Network (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 8 June 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. Public Question Time

No written questions from the public had been received.

4. Treasury Management Outturn 2019 – 2020

The Commission considered report [FIN/502](#) with the Head of Corporate Finance and the Chief Accountant. The CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management recommends that Councillors be updated on treasury management activities regularly and the report ensured the Council was implementing best practice in accordance with the Code. The report provided details of the outturn position for treasury activities and highlighted compliance with the Council's policies previously approved by Councillors.

During the discussion, the following points were expressed:

- Acknowledgement that all funds were managed internally.
- Clarification offered on the maturity structure together with number of detailed holdings.
- Confirmation provided that the major repairs reserve reduction had been spent throughout the year on capital spend mostly on new council dwellings.
- In terms of income generation and creative investments, it was acknowledged that investments were restricted as the Council was governed by CIFPA and the Government. The Treasury Strategy prioritises investments accordingly whilst providing an appropriate balance between security, liquidity, yield and ethical considerations.
- Explanations were sought and obtained on the details provided within appendices.
- Recognition that investment properties were evaluated annually and the parades were classed as non-operational properties, along with others with a similar description within the portfolio.

RESOLVED

That Commission notes the report and requests that the views expressed during the debate, are fed back to the Cabinet through the Commission's Comment sheet.

5. Financial Outturn 2019/20 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 4

The Commission considered report [FIN/500](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance on the quarter 4 budget monitoring, which set out a summary of the Council's outturn for the year for both revenue and capital spending for the financial year 2019/20. It identifies the main variations from the approved spending levels and any potential impact on future budgets.

During the discussion with the Head of Corporate Finance and Chief Accountant, Councillors made the following comments:

- Acknowledgement that the report documented the financial viability of the council, particularly as a result of Covid19.
- Recognition that the flood programme had been reprioritised, allowing for Tilgate Lake bank erosion works to commence ahead of schedule.
- Confirmation that the under/over spend and slippage on the HRA improvement works had been listed as a whole programme of works as opposed to being broken down on individual projects. It was commented that further breakdown would be beneficial.
- Explanation sought and obtained on the reserves for expenditure in Tilgate Park and Nature Centre as part of the 5 year investment plan.
- Acknowledgement that revenue implications needed to be taken into account for new properties to avoid overspend.
- Clarification sought and obtained on the details provided within appendices.
- General support for the report. However, it was queried whether the S106 money in 8.15 referred to the Ewhurst playing fields in Ifield (as documented in December 2013 Cabinet report) or Ewhurst Road Play Area as set out in recommendation in 2.2b (which is in West Green). It was requested Cabinet clarify the arrangement for the S106 funding given the inconsistencies.

RESOLVED

That Commission notes the report and requests that the views expressed during the debate, are fed back to the Cabinet through the Commission's Comment sheet but requested Cabinet clarify the arrangements for the S106 funding.

Note from Head of Corporate Finance – it has subsequently been confirmed the site is Ewhurst Playing Fields play area, Ifield.

6. Forward Programme of Key Procurements

The Commission considered report [FIN/501](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance. The report sought approval for the current forward programme of key procurements and together with delegated authority for contract award approvals following the appropriate procurement process.

During the discussion with the Head of Corporate Finance and Procurement Manager, Councillors made the following comments:

- Recognition that the Council's procurement is governed by the EU Public Procurement Directives and the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and Council's Procurement Code. Confirmation that when the UK leaves the EU, advertising may change but the EU Public Procurement Directives were enshrined in UK law.
- Acknowledgement that the process would promote greater transparency and awareness of key procurement projects. Internal stakeholders would input into the process at an earlier stage and the organisations could manage resources more effectively.
- Confirmation was provided regarding the delegation process.
- Recognition that after the award of contracts there was involvement and consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member as posed in recommendation 2.2c. It was felt that this engagement should also be included in recommendation 2.2b at the award of contract stage so as to further enhance the greater transparency and involvement. It was subsequently recommended that Recommendation 2.2b be amended to include consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member. Following an unanimous vote, it was agreed that the Cabinet be requested to consider this addition and Recommendation 2.2b would now read:

Delegate authority to the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member, the relevant Head of Service, and Head of Legal, Democracy and HR to approve the award of the contract following an appropriate procurement process.

RESOLVED

That Commission notes the report and requests that the views expressed during the debate, are fed back to the Cabinet through the Commission's Comment sheet and requests Cabinet to consider the proposed amendment to Recommendation '2.2b' above.

7. EV Charging Infrastructure Network

The Commission considered report [PES/364](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning. The report sought to approve the partnering with WSCC, along with other districts and boroughs across the county, on a scheme to develop an extensive county-wide EV

charging network, by nominating sites in the borough council's ownership to be part of this EV charging network.

During the discussion with the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability, Head of Economy and Planning and the Sustainability Manager, the following comments were made:

- Reduced emissions were welcomed but it was noted that the vehicle batteries had a finite lifetime and could not be recycled. However there were second uses for batteries like energy storage. There was a discussion about hydrogen vehicles as an alternative to EVs. It was noted that there were a small number of hydrogen vehicles on the market but they were still very expensive and the re-filling infrastructure was not yet widespread and was technically challenging.
- It was noted that throughout the programme of work the additional pressure on the existing power infrastructure should be considered.
- Recognition that the list of sites was not definitive or confirmed and was also in addition to those proposed by WSCC. There was currently an option to recommend sites on the WSCC website
- Whilst supportive of the report there was concern raised surrounding the number of spaces and potential concentration of the sites, which may overwhelm some areas. Consultation with ward Members would be welcomed in order gain an understanding of the local area during any feasibility studies.
- Clarification was provided on fast and rapid charge points together with further information on the main types of charging infrastructure.
- It was noted that the procurement would be managed by WSCC and further discussion took place surrounding the Real Living Wage.
- Acknowledgement that the issue of parking remained throughout the town and enforcement could take place through the usual channels for penalty use of EV charging points.

RESOLVED

That Commission notes the report and requests that the views expressed during the debate, are fed back to the Cabinet through the Commission's Comment Sheet.

8. Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

During the discussion with the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability, Head of Economy and Planning and the Sustainability Manager, the following comments were made:

- Officers were commended on a detailed and interesting report.
- Recognition that Crawley's cycling and walking numbers were below the county average, mainly due to safety, busy roads and connectivity.
- It was noted there was a need to instil public confidence in cycling and walking through separate space for cycling lanes, bike security and encouraging active travel.
- Acknowledgement that five sets of cycle counters were in place to evaluate cycle trips. Whilst not monitoring speed it was proposed that all newly developed cycle routes would include a plan for monitoring and evaluating their use and effectiveness.

- General support for the report, and to encourage access throughout the town however those who were not able to easily travel should not be at a disadvantage by the infrastructure established. There needed to be a balance.
- Concern was raised regarding some of the traffic management plans proposed within the appendices. It was noted these may have a detrimental effect on other users and it was therefore suggested that it would be beneficial that ward and county councillors were included in the consultation of any potential scheme.

RESOLVED

That Commission notes the report and requests that the views expressed during the debate, are fed back to the Cabinet through the Commission's Comment sheet.

9. Forthcoming Decision List - and Provisional List of Reports for the Commission's following Meetings

The Commission confirmed the following reports:

28 September 2020

Budget Strategy 2021/22 – 2025/26
2020/2021 Budget Monitoring Q1
Crawley Arts and Culture Proposition

23 November 2020

Treasury Management Mid-Year Review 2020-2021
2020/2021 Budget Monitoring Q2
Budget Strategy Mid-Year Review

1 February 2021

2021/2022 Budget and Council Tax
Treasury Management Strategy 2021-2022

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.38 pm

T Rana (Chair)

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Cabinet

Wednesday, 24 June 2020 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

P K Lamb (Chair)	Leader of the Council
I T Irvine	Cabinet Member for Housing
G S Jhans	Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability
C J Mullins	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
P C Smith	Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development and Deputy Leader

Also in Attendance:

Councillor D Crow, R D Burrett and T Rana

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Ann-Maria Brown	Head of Legal, Democracy and HR
Ian Duke	Deputy Chief Executive
Karen Hayes	Head of Corporate Finance
Chris Pedlow	Democratic Services Manager
Heather Girling	Democratic Services Officer
Karen Dodds	Head of Crawley Homes
Clem Smith	Head of Economy and Planning
Louise Skipton-Carter	Sustainability Manager

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor B A Smith

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 March 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

3. Public Question Time

There were no questions from the public.

4. Further Notice of Intention to Conduct Business in Private and Notifications of any Representations

It was reported that no representations had been received in respect of agenda items 14 and 15: *Appointment of Supplier for the implementation and support of a new Fully Integrated Housing and Asset Management Database System* and *HRA Budget for Purchase of Land or Property*, respectively.

5. Matters referred to the Cabinet and any Report from the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission

It was confirmed that no matters had been referred to the Cabinet for further consideration.

6. Treasury Management Outturn for 2019/20

The Leader presented report [FIN/502](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance which set out details of the Council's annual treasury management review of activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2019/20. The Cabinet noted that regulations required treasury management policy to be reviewed annually. It was noted that the Council's financial decisions for 2019/20 were taken in line with the Ethical Investment Policy.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 22 June 2020, which included:

- That confirmation had been provided that the major repairs reserve reduction had been spent throughout the year on capital spend mostly on new council dwellings.
- Acknowledgment that investments were restricted as the Council was governed by CIFPA and the Government, and that the Treasury Strategy prioritises investments accordingly whilst providing an appropriate balance between security, liquidity, yield and ethical considerations.
- Recognition that investment properties were evaluated annually and the neighbourhood parades were classed as non-operational properties, along with others with a similar description within the portfolio.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendations in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendations, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendations:
Councillors Irvine, Jhans, Lamb, Mullins, and P Smith. (5)

Against the recommendations:
None. (0)

Abstentions:
None. (0)

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet:

- a) approves the actual 2019/20 Prudential and Treasury Indicators as set out in the report;
- b) notes the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2019/20.

Reasons for the Recommendations

The Council's financial regulations, in accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management, requires an annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the Strategy. This report complies with these requirements.

7. Financial Outturn 2019/20 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 4

The Leader presented report [FIN/500](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance which set out a summary of the Council's outturn for both revenue and capital spending for the financial year running from 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020. It identified the main variations from the approved spending levels and any potential impact on future budgets. The Cabinet noted that the report had been prepared toward the beginning of the COVID-19 crisis, and thus the full financial consequences of the crisis were not included within the report and would instead be reported on in future Budget Monitoring reports.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 22 June 2020, which included:

- Confirmation that the under/over spend and slippage on the HRA improvement works had been listed as a whole programme of works as opposed to being broken down on individual projects. It was commented that further breakdown would be beneficial.
- Explanation sought and obtained on the reserves for expenditure in Tilgate Park and Nature Centre as part of the 5 year investment plan.
- Acknowledgement that revenue implications needed to be taken into account for new properties to avoid overspend.
- Whether the S106 money in 8.15 referred to the Ewhurst playing fields in Ifield (as documented in December 2013 Cabinet report) or Ewhurst Road Play Area as set out in recommendation in 2.2(b) (which is in West Green). It was

requested Cabinet clarify the arrangement for the S106 funding given the inconsistencies.

It had since been confirmed that recommendation 2.2(b) concerned Ewhurst playing fields, Ifield.

Councillor Crow was invited to speak on the item. Matters raised included:

- Clarification was sought that the figure of £26,000 in savings, as a result of the cancellation of the May 2020 local elections, was correct.
- A query regarding the potential to create further savings in business rates, after a £42,000 saving was made due to the demolition of parts of the Town Hall building.
- Acknowledgement that expected effects on port health services due to Brexit did not materialise, resulting in unplanned income of £37,000.
- Recognition that budget-saving decisions may need to be taken by local authorities in the future, including by Crawley Borough Council, in order to 'balance the books'.

The Leader offered the following responses:

- May 2020 also saw the Local Police and Crime Commissioner election cancelled. It was expected that further savings in this area would be announced next quarter.
- Business rates paid by the Council on the Town Hall building could not be avoided.
- The expected decrease of £37,000 in port health services was predicted at the last budget, at which time a Brexit deal had not yet been established.
- Savings of around £2 million would need to be made, in conversation with residents, in order to reduce the impact of the economic consequences of COVID-19.

All Cabinet Members present spoke as part of the discussion on the report. It was acknowledged that the 2019/20 budget surplus of £245,000, although welcomed, was not expected to be maintained in the face of the predicted £4 million shortfall following the COVID-19 crisis. The implications on specific Cabinet Member Portfolios were also discussed. It was noted that the 2019/20 financial year was the fifth consecutive year that the Council had seen a budget surplus.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendations in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendations, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendations:

Councillors Irvine, Jhans, Lamb, Mullins, and P Smith. (5)

Against the recommendations:

None. (0)

Abstentions:

None. (0)

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet

- a) notes the outturn for the year 2019/20 as summarised in this report and to note that future years impact as a result of Covid-19 will be presented in the monitoring report to Cabinet in September 2020.
- b) approves a supplementary capital estimate of £1,500 which will be funded from S106 contributions for the Ewhurst Road Play Area as outlined in paragraph 8.15 of the report.

Recommendation 4

That Full Council be recommended to retrospectively approve a transfer of £1.192m to the business rates equalisation reserve as outlined in paragraph 9.2.

Reasons for the Recommendations

To report to Members on the outturn for the year compared to the approved budget for 2019/20.

8. Forward Programme of Key Procurements

The Leader presented report [FIN/501](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance which set out the procurement forward programme. The programme identified the Council's key procurements that will require tendering over the coming six month period, which consisted of the following contracts:

- Disabled Adaptations (Crawley Homes)
- Unified Telecoms
- Temp Agency Staff
- Building Repairs & Maintenance
- District Heat Network – Operation, Maintenance, Metering and Billing.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 22 June 2020, which included:

- Recognition that the Council's procurement is governed by the EU Public Procurement Directives and the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and Council's Procurement Code. Confirmation that when the UK leaves the EU, advertising may change but the EU Public Procurement Directives were enshrined in UK law.
- Recognition that after the award of contracts there was involvement and consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member as posed in recommendation 2.2(c). It was felt that this engagement should also be included in recommendation 2.2(b) at the award of contract stage so as to further enhance the greater transparency and involvement. It was subsequently recommended that recommendation 2.2(b) be amended to include consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member. Following an unanimous vote, it was agreed that the Cabinet be requested to consider this addition and recommendation 2.2(b)

would now read: *'delegates authority to the Leader of the Council in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member, the relevant Head of Service, and Head of Legal, Democracy and HR to approve the award of the contract following an appropriate procurement process'*.

Cabinet Members agreed that the proposed amendment to recommendation 2.2(b) be accepted.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendations, including amended recommendation 2.2(b), in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendations, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendations:

Councillors Irvine, Jhans, Lamb, Mullins, and P Smith. (5)

Against the recommendations:

None. (0)

Abstentions:

None. (0)

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet

- a) approves the procurement forward programme June 2020 – December 2020.
- b) delegates authority to the Leader of the Council in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member, the relevant Head of Service, and Head of Legal, Democracy and HR to approve the award of the contract following an appropriate procurement process.
- c) delegates the negotiation, approval and completion of all relevant legal documentation, following the awarding of the contracts to the relevant Head of Service, Head of Legal, Democracy and HR, Head of Corporate Finance, in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member.

(Generic Delegations 2 & 3 will be used to enact this recommendation)

Reasons for the Recommendations

By approving the procurement forward programme there is greater transparency of future procurement processes allowing more scope for internal stakeholders to input into how future contracts are delivered.

The approval of the forward programme provides a key decision that will enable the individual procurement processes to be awarded under delegated authority once the tender process has concluded giving the Council the ability to reduce the time required to complete a procurement process.

9. EV Charging Infrastructure Network

The Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability presented report [PES/364](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning. In December 2019, West Sussex County Council (WSCC) adopted an Electric Vehicle (EV) Strategy which set out a plan to procure a supplier to deliver a county-wide EV charging network. It had been requested that Crawley Borough Council partake in the scheme and nominate sites for the erection of EV charging points.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 22 June 2020, which included:

- Reduced emissions were welcomed but it was noted that the vehicle batteries had a finite lifetime and could not be recycled - however there were second uses for batteries such as energy storage.
- The additional pressure on the existing power infrastructure should be considered.
- Recognition that the list of sites was not definitive nor confirmed and was also in addition to those proposed by WSCC, and that there was currently an option to recommend sites on the WSCC website.
- Concerns surrounding the number of spaces and potential concentration of the sites, which may overwhelm some areas. Consultation with ward Councillors would be welcomed.
- Acknowledgement that the issue of parking remained throughout the town and enforcement could take place through the usual channels for penalty use of EV charging points.

Councillors P Smith, Lamb, Mullins, and Jhans spoke as part of the discussion on the report. Cabinet Members expressed general support for the proposals, and it was noted that creation of sufficient infrastructure for EV would facilitate a reduction in carbon emissions. The figure that 30% of households in the borough do not have off-road parking and thus would be unable to install an EV charging point was queried. Concerns were also raised about the potentially inhibitory cost of electric cars. It was recognised that there would be potential for the Council to suggest changes to the WSCC strategy, including the charging point sites, at a later date.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendations in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendations, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendations:

Councillors Irvine, Jhans, Lamb, Mullins, and P Smith. (5)

Against the recommendations:

None. (0)

Abstentions:

None. (0)

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet

- a) approves, in principle that the Council takes part in the EV Charging Infrastructure Network scheme, led by WSCC who will procure an EV infrastructure provider, through a concession contract to deliver an extensive EV charging network across the Borough.
- b) delegates authority to the Head of Economy and Planning, to undertake further discussions with WSCC, including consideration of any necessary associated documentation to progress the delivery of these services to benefit the borough.*
- c) delegates authority to the Head of Economy and Planning, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability, the approval of the Council entering into the scheme depending on the results of the tender process*

**(Generic Delegation 7 will be used to enact this recommendation).*

Reasons for the Recommendations

Tangible Action in response to the Climate Change Emergency Declaration

Transport contributes over a third of the carbon emission across Crawley Borough (250 ktCO₂ pA) and is the one sector that is on an upward trend, and therefore in order to meet the obligations of our Climate Emergency declaration, the Council should work as quickly as possible to enable residents to switch to low emissions vehicles.

Lack of EV Charging Infrastructure is holding back EV take up

One of the main barriers to increased take-up of low emissions vehicles is the lack of charging infrastructure. We know that residents would prefer to charge their car at or near their homes. We also know that 30% of households do not have access to off road parking and will find it hard to make the switch to EV. Providing chargers for these people is vital, and the scheme proposed by WSCC will address this.

No Maintenance Liability or Cost to CBC

WSCC will be procuring a concession contract to install a network of EV charge points across the county. With the option to extend, the 7 year concession contract will be delivered entirely by the preferred supplier, who will be responsible for joint planning, funding, building, marketing and operating a publicly accessible charge point network across West Sussex, as well as providing an on-going 24/7 service (including the management of payments and support), with full responsibility for maintenance and repair to ensure the network is fully operational at all times.

The “Fast Track” roll out of EV Charging Infrastructure

The scheme will use a portfolio based approach using commercially attractive sites to support less viable sites. Fast and rapid charge points will be installed on-street, in public sector car parks, and on community assets county wide, providing charging primarily for those residents and businesses who do not have access to off road parking. The provider will be contractually obliged to fast track infrastructure roll out.

Crawley will benefit from EV Infrastructure going elsewhere in West Sussex

Horsham, Adur & Worthing, Arun and Mid Sussex District Councils are all planning to be involved in the scheme. The contract will be made available to other defined Contracting Bodies to join, such as district, boroughs, parish councils and incorporate parish halls, community centres etc. over the lifetime of the contract.

Improvements to Air Quality in Crawley

Recent analyses pre-COVID 19 crisis have indicated that the air quality situation in parts of the Borough was getting significantly worse, particularly as regards NOx and particulate pollution. The rapid uplift in available EV charging infrastructure will incentivise conversion to electric vehicles to help enhance air quality.

10. Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

The Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability presented report [PES/363](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which set out details of the draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP); a costed plan developed in line with Department for Transport guidance that aimed to establish borough-wide cycling and walking areas through a programme of infrastructure improvements. The draft LCWIP was to be approved for public consultation in order to identify further areas for inclusion in the Plan.

Councillor Rana presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 22 June 2020, which included:

- The need to instil public confidence in cycling and walking through separate space for cycling lanes, bike security and encouraging active travel. On balance, those who were not able to easily travel should not be at a disadvantage by the infrastructure established.
- Acknowledgement that five sets of cycle counters were in place to evaluate cycle trips. Whilst not monitoring speed it was proposed that all newly developed cycle routes would include a plan for monitoring and evaluating their use and effectiveness.
- Concern was raised regarding some of the traffic management plans proposed within the appendices. It was noted these may have a detrimental effect on other users and it was therefore suggested that it would be beneficial that ward and county councillors were included in the consultation of any potential scheme.

Councillor Crow was invited to speak on the item. Matters raised included the costing of the LCWIP, which was estimated at £23.5 million, and the possibility that the LCWIP could be seen by members of the public to penalise motorists instead of ensuring a balance to benefit all road and pavement users.

All Cabinet Members present spoke as part of the discussion and expressed general approval for the proposals in the report. Discussion occurred on parking, the climate emergency, and air quality in the borough, as well as the need to ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians. It was noted that the cost of the proposed plans was an estimate. The Cabinet also noted that the plans formed part of a national Government initiative to improve walking and cycling infrastructure.

Upon receiving a query regarding who was to be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the proposed plans in the LCWIP, the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability suggested that this would fall to the Highways authority at WSCC.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendations in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and

against the recommendations, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendations:

Councillors Irvine, Jhans, Lamb, Mullins, and P Smith. (5)

Against the recommendations:

None. (0)

Abstentions:

None. (0)

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet:

- a) approves the draft Crawley LCWIP that has been developed for consultation
 - b) delegates authority to the Head of Economy and Planning*, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability, to consider the responses to the consultation and either:
 - i) make minor amendments to the Crawley LCWIP in response to the consultation and adopt the amended the LCWIP*
- or**
- ii) if there are major amendments required to the draft plan then produce an updated version of the Crawley LCWIP follow further Cabinet consideration and adoption.

**(Generic Delegation 7 will be used to enact this recommendation).*

Reasons for the Recommendations

The LCWIP provides a key document to inform the planning authority Local Plan. This enables clear discussions with developers on providing safe, accessible, connected, people-centred neighbourhoods for homes and business, ensuring full linkage with the wider town cycle network and formally evaluated walking routes.

Having an LCWIP will put Crawley Borough Council in a favourable position to apply for government funding for walking & cycling schemes when this comes forward.

11. Exempt Information – Exclusion of the Public (Subject to Agenda Item 5)

RESOLVED

That in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified against the item.

12. Appointment of Supplier for the implementation and support of a new Fully Integrated Housing and Asset Management Database System

Exempt Paragraph 3 – *Information relating to financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information)*

The Cabinet Member for Housing presented report CH/189 of the Head of Crawley Homes which sought Cabinet approval for the award of contract to the preferred successful bidder, following a competitive tender exercise and evaluation process, for the award of a contract for the supply and implementation of a hosted housing management software solution.

It was noted that the proposed contract was for a six-year term period commencing on 13 July 2020, with a four-year optional extension period, subject to the suppliers' satisfactory performance.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendations in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendations, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendations:
Councillors Irvine, Jhans, Lamb, Mullins, and P Smith. (5)

Against the recommendations:
None. (0)

Abstentions:
None. (0)

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet

- a) approves the appointment of Bidder 3 for the supply and implementation of a fully hosted Housing Management software solution for a period of six years from 13 July 2020, with the option to extend for a further four years.
- b) delegates to the Head of Crawley Homes and the Head of Legal, Democratic and HR Services to complete and enter into the contract.*
- c) delegates to the Head of Crawley Homes and the Head of Legal, Democratic and HR Services the ability to apply the four year extension at the end of the initial term subject to performance review.*

*(Generic Delegation 2 will be used to enact this recommendation).

Reasons for the Recommendations

Following a tender exercise and evaluation, the provider identified in paragraph 2.2 of this report has submitted the most economically advantageous tender to ensure a fully integrated Housing and Asset Management Database System to assist in.

HRA Budget for Purchase of Land or Property

Exempt Paragraph 3 – *Information relating to financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information)*

The Cabinet Member for Housing presented report CH/190 of the Head of Crawley Homes which sought changes to agreed budgets and delegations to enable the Council to purchase land or property for the delivery of housing within the HRA.

Councillors Mullins also spoke in support of the report.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendations in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendations, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendations:

Councillors Irvine, Jhans, Lamb, Mullins, and P Smith. (5)

Against the recommendations:

None. (0)

Abstentions:

None. (0)

RESOLVED

Recommendation 5

That Full Council be recommended to

- a) agrees to change to the budget heading of Acquisition Buy Back of Dwellings to Acquisition of Land or Dwellings.
- b) agrees to change the budget heading of Purchase of Edinburgh House to Purchase of Properties.
- c) delegates joint authority to the Head of Crawley Homes and the Head of Corporate Finance* in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Leader of the Council to purchase suitable land or property for the delivery of housing within the limits of the HRA budgets identified in 2.1 a and b.

*(Generic Delegation 8 will be used to enact this recommendation).

- d) amends the financial approval levels within the Constitution to ensure that they reflect the ability of the Council to purchase acquisitions efficiently within the agreed budgets

Reasons for the Recommendations

There are opportunities to purchase either land or property that would benefit the council's ambition to develop affordable housing, but the process of agreement through Cabinet and Full Council means that the council is not able to act quickly and can lose out to other developers.

This will allow the Council to continue the delivery of dwellings funded from the HRA as part of HRA business plan and the Council's RTB Receipts (one-for-one) funding programme and provide housing for Crawley residents in need from the housing register.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Cabinet concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.35 pm

P K LAMB
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Monday, 29 June 2020 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

S Malik (Chair)

T McAleney (Vice-Chair)

L M Ascough, A Belben, J Hart, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, G S Jhans, M Mwagale, J Purdy and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Jean McPherson Group Manager (Development Management)

Valerie Cheesman Principal Planning Officer

Hamish Walke Principal Planning Officer

Mez Matthews Democratic Services Officer

Jess Tamplin Democratic Services Support Officer

Also in Attendance:

Councillors B J Burgess, C J Mullins, and R Sharma

1. Disclosure of Interests

The following disclosures of interests were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Interest
Councillor A Belben	Agenda Item 7 – Planning Application CR/2020/0054/FUL – 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal interest – was lobbied by people known to him
Councillor Purdy	Agenda Item 7 – Planning Application CR/2020/0054/FUL – 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal interest – member of Hazelwick Road Conservation Area Advisory Committee

2. Lobbying Declarations

The following lobbying declarations were made by Councillors:-

Councillors Ascough, Irvine, and Malik had been lobbied regarding application CR/2020/0020/FUL – 6 Lundy Close, Broadfield, Crawley.

Councillors A Belben and Purdy had been lobbied regarding application CR/2020/0054/FUL – 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 April 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Planning Application CR/2019/0589/FUL - Sullivan Drive, Bewbush, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/352a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Construction of a bus gate to enable buses to pass between the residential neighbourhoods of Bewbush and Kilnwood Vale along with associated pedestrian walkway, drainage and landscaping (amended plans received).

Councillors A Belben, Jaggard, Mwagale, and Purdy declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application. The Committee was reminded that the application had been granted planning permission in January 2020 (report [PES/328a](#)), subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement which was required to mitigate for a shortfall in replacement trees at the application site. The applicant had since worked with Crawley Borough Council on amended plans for 59 trees to be planted within the CBC boundary at the site, and the revised level of planting was 6 more than required by policy CH6 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030. The tree mitigation could now be accommodated on the site and therefore the Section 106 agreement was no longer needed.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, a statement submitted in support of the application by Mr J Beavan, the planning agent on behalf of the applicant, was read to the Committee. Details of the proposed scheme were presented such as the species mix of the trees and the intended appearance of the landscaping.

The Committee then considered the application. In response to a query from a Committee member regarding the density of the proposed trees, it was clarified that the proposed distance between the trees was in line with arboricultural standards.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to permit:
Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Mwagale, Purdy, and P Smith. (11)

Against the recommendation to permit:
None.

Abstentions:
None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to conditions set out in report [PES/352a](#).

5. **Planning Application CR/2020/0020/FUL - 6 Lundy Close, Broadfield, Crawley**

The Committee considered report [PES/352b](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Demolition of existing single storey garage & timber garden room & erection of 1x two bedroom dwelling & new detached garage for 6 Lundy Close.

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Irvine, Jaggard, and Malik declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (HW) provided a verbal summation of the application.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, five statements submitted by members of the public in regard to the application were read to the Committee.

Three statements from objectors (Mr D Howard, Mrs B Taylor-Ginman and Mr C Ginman, and Mrs G Mallet) highlighted matters including:

- The potential for the placement of the proposed development to create a lack of privacy and a loss of light to neighbouring houses, impacting mental health
- A loss of light to the nearby footpath causing concerns of an increase in crime.

One statement from the applicants (Mr and Mrs Wise) highlighted matters including:

- Clarification of the proximity of the proposed two bedroom dwelling to neighbouring houses, at 10.9 metres
- The inclusion of obscured glass on one window of the dwelling to mitigate loss of privacy of neighbouring houses.

One statement from a Ward Councillor for Gossops Green and North East Broadfield (Councillor C Mullins) highlighted matters including:

- The proposed development causing a high-density feeling to the area
- A concern that neighbouring dwellings could be negatively affected by the proposed 10.9 metre separation distance due to the non-standard layout of the properties on Lundy Close.

The Committee then considered the application. Committee members sought clarification on the compliance of the driveway in terms of road safety, and it was noted that West Sussex County Council's Highways department had made no objection to the design of the shared driveway. Concerns were raised regarding the effects on neighbouring properties such as a potential loss of light and privacy. The Committee heard that these matters were deemed acceptable as the plans for the proposed dwelling were policy-compliant. Upon receiving a query regarding the owners of the site, it was confirmed that the land had not been previously owned nor sold by Crawley Borough Council.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to permit:

Councillors A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Mwagale, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to permit:

Councillor Ascough. (1)

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the conclusion of a Section 106 agreement to secure an off-site affordable housing contribution of £8,178, and subject to the conditions set out in report [PES/352b](#).

6. Planning Application CR/2020/0054/FUL - 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/352c](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Erection of two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Jhans, and Purdy declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (VC) provided a verbal summation of the application. The Committee was informed that a previous application for planning permission for a separate dwelling at the site had been received and refused, partly due to its classification within Flood Zone 3a and that the applicant had failed to satisfy the flood risk tests. The current application was for an extension to the existing dwelling at the same site. The Environment Agency had advised that the site was now classified as being within Flood Zone 2, and so the application did not require those specific flood risk tests to be carried out. The application was thus to be judged against the Environment Agency's standing advice and the flood resilient measures proposed were considered to be acceptable.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, five statements submitted by members of the public in regard to the application were read to the Committee.

Two statements from objectors (Mr A Bayne and Ms N Edwards) highlighted matters including:

- Existing difficulties with car parking in the area and access limitations due to the narrowness of Mill Road
- A potential for the proposed development to cause a loss of historical value to the Crawley Conservation Area.

One statement from the planning agent (Architecture for London) highlighted matters including:

- That issues with the previously submitted application had been addressed
- The sustainable location of the proposed development.

Two statements from Ward Councillors for Three Bridges (Councillors B Burgess and R Burgess) highlighted matters including:

- The scale of the proposed extension in relation to the existing property
- The previous refusal of a planning application at the site and the similarities between that application and the current application.

The Committee then considered the application. Members of the Committee expressed concerns that the proposed development may not be in keeping with the size and style of properties on Mill Road due to its scale and thus would have a detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area. It was noted that conditions four and five of the recommendation required that details of the materials and windows to be used in the construction of the extension be submitted for approval. The Committee also considered car parking availability on Mill Road, and noted that West Sussex County Council's Highways department had no objections on highway safety grounds. It was also clarified that whilst there would be a loss of two to three off-road spaces arising from the construction of the extension, it was considered that there was sufficient capacity in terms of on-street parking.

In response to a query from a Committee member as to whether a condition could be applied to prevent the property being split into two dwellings at a later date, it was explained that such a condition would not meet the relevant tests for a domestic extension, but if the unit was subdivided, this would constitute a breach of planning control and the Council could enforce against the development.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to permit:

Councillors Hart, Irvine, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, and P Smith. (6)

Against the recommendation to permit:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Mwagale, and Purdy. (5)

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to conditions set out in report [PES/352c](#).

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.36 pm

S Malik (Chair)