

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 **Ashurst Main Hall - The Charis Centre**, on **Wednesday, 20 October 2021** at **7.30 pm**

Nightline Telephone No. 07881 500 227

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Hurford".

Chief Executive

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

Published 12 October 2021

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.



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 are reminded that it is a requirement to declare interests where appropriate.	
3. Minutes To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 14 July 2021	5 - 22
4. Communications To receive and consider any announcements or communications, including any additional Cabinet Member announcements.	
5. Public Question Time To answer public questions under Full Council Procedure Rule 1.1-E. The questions must be on matters which are relevant to the functions of the Council, and should not include statements. One supplementary question from the questioner will be allowed. Up to 30 minutes is allocated to Public Question Time.	
6. Petitions - "the closure and change of use for the Millpond site at Bewbush and the site at Cherry Lane, Langley Green" This item seeks consideration of a petition, submitted as an e-petition via a third party provider that was received by the Council's Petitions Officer. The petition contains over 1000 valid signatures and as such is required to be debated at Full Council. The Full Council is asked to consider report LDS/174 by the Council's Petition Officer which details the petition <i>"On the closure and change of use for the Millpond site at Bewbush and the site at Cherry Lane, Langley Green"</i> and the procedure for considering the petition including that in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, the Full Council has a maximum of 30 minutes at each meeting to consider	23 - 24

	Pages
<p>petitions. Within this time the Principal Petitioner will be given five minutes to present the petition to the Council and the remaining time will be for the Council to consider the petition.</p>	
<p>7. Consideration of Full Council Recommendations and Call-In Decisions</p> <p>To consider any recommendations before the Full Council or items which have been Called-In.</p> <p><i>NB In advance of the meeting Political Groups will identify which recommendations they do not wish to reserve for debate.</i></p>	25 - 86
<p>8. Crawley City Status Bid - Recommendation 2</p> <p>The Full Council is asked to consider report CEx/56 by the Chief Executive.</p>	87 - 92
<p>9. Notice Of Motion 1 - Motion Amending The Requirements Of A Procedural Motion</p> <p>To consider, in accordance with Full Council Procedure Rule 1.1-H, the following Notice of Motion to be moved by Councillor Lamb and seconded by Councillor Lunnon.</p>	93 - 94
<p>10. Notice of Motion 2 - Land West of Ifield / Crawley</p> <p>To consider, in accordance with Full Council Procedure Rule 1.1-H, the following Notice of Motion to be moved by Councillor Bounds and seconded by Councillor Crow.</p>	95 - 96
<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 also 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>	

12. Receiving the Minutes of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Other Committees including Items for Debate

To receive the minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Committees, as listed on page 25, and set out in the appendices to this item and to debate any Reserved Items contained within those Minutes.

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.

13. Supplemental Agenda

Any urgent item(s) complying with Section 100(B) of the Local Government Act 1972.

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, 14 July 2021 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

S Malik (Mayor)

M Flack (Deputy Mayor)

Z Ali, M L Ayling, A Belben, T G Belben, J Bounds, S Buck, B J Burgess, R G Burgess, R D Burrett, D Crow, C R Eade, R S Fiveash, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, G S Jhans, K Khan, M G Jones, P K Lamb, R A Lanzer, T Lunnon, K McCarthy, J Millar-Smith, M Morris, C J Mullins, S Mullins, M Mwagale, A Nawaz, D M Peck, A Pendlington, M W Pickett, S Piggott, S Raja and P C Smith

Also in Attendance:

Mr Russell Brown Appointed Independent Person

Mr Peter Nicolson Appointed Independent Person

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl Chief Executive

Siraj Choudhury Head of Legal, Governance and HR

Heather Girling Democratic Services Officer

Chris Pedlow Democratic Services Manager

Mr Russell Brown Appointed Independent Person

Mr Peter Nicolson Appointed Independent Person

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor B A Smith

1. Disclosures of Interest

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

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 28 May 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

3. Communications

The Mayor firstly highlighted that he had included a written statement for their information under the Communication Agenda item within the Supplementary Agenda – Order Paper. The Mayor informed the meeting that the ceremony for Member's Long Service Badges and gifts to retired Councillors was currently scheduled to take place at the next ordinary meeting of the Full Council on 20 October 2021. The Mayor then commented that he would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the England Football Team on the tremendous progress they made in the recent Euro 2020 tournament. He hoped that they could go a step further at the World Cup next year. In particular, the Mayor stated he would like to pass the Council's best wishes to Gareth Southgate who of course grew up and went to school in our Borough. Members would recall remember that he received a Pride of Crawley Award in 2019.

The Mayor also informed the Full Council that there will be an extraordinary Full Council meeting being held on Wednesday 15 September 2021.

4. Public Question Time

There were no questions from the public.

5. Confirmed Total Final External Audit Fees for 2019/20 - (Recommendation 1)

The Chair of the Audit Committee Councillor Millar-Smith introduced to Full Council, Recommendation 1 – Confirmed Total Final External Audit Fees for 2019/20 which had previously been considered by the Audit Committee at its meeting held on 29 April 2021. Councillor Millar-Smith also moved an amendment to Recommendation 1 as detailed on page 19 of the Supplementary Agenda – Order Paper. In presenting the item it was noted the recommendation related to the unplanned and unexplained increase of over £40k to the audit fees by the Council's external auditors Ernst and Young (EY). It was noted that the Councillor Millar-Smith had, with the Head of Corporate Finance, raised the increased audit fees with Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA), the body that oversees, appoints, and sets the scales of fees for Local Authorities' External Auditors.

It was noted that EY and our dedicate auditor were invited to attend the Full Council meeting to address the concerns raised by the Audit Committee, but they declined the opportunity.

Both the recommendation and the proposed amendment were seconded by Councillor Flack in her role as Vice Chair of the Audit Committee.

Councillor Crow also spoke on this item.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council

- 1) considered and notes the justification presented by Ernst and Young and any further information or updates relevant to the matter.

- 2) agrees that the Chair of the Audit Committee to write again to the PSAA and EY stating that the Council feel that they have failed to justify the substantial fee increase.

6. Appointment of a Temporary Chair of the Full Council Meeting

In advance of the next item when the Full Council Recommendation 2 – Further Deliberations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Mayoral Allowances 2021/22 and 2022/23), the Mayor stated that he and the Deputy Mayor Councillor Flack have declared an interest for the next item and as such would be leaving the meeting for the discussion and vote on the Recommendation 2 and therefore, they would be relinquish the positions of Chair and Vice Chair of the meeting for the item.

The Mayor then sought a nomination to Chair the next item. Councillor Lanzer was nominated by Councillor Crow and seconded by Councillor McCarthy. With no other nominations it was agreed that Councillor Lanzer be appointed as the Chair for the next item.

Then having declared an Interest in the next item Recommendation 2 – Further Deliberations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Mayoral Allowances 2021/22 and 2022/23) Councillors Flack, Lamb and Malik left the meeting for the remaining duration of the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting on the Recommendation.

7. Further Deliberations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Mayoral Allowances 2021/22 and 2022/23 - (Recommendation 2)

The Full Council considered report [LDS/169](#) of the Chair of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) which detailed the findings of the IRP and its independent recommendations regarding the Mayoral Allowances for 2021/22 and 2022/23.

The item had been previously considered at the Governance Committee on 22 June 2021. Councillor McCarthy moved the recommendation which was seconded and supported by Councillor Burrett.

Councillor Lunnon moved and presented the amendment to the Recommendation, namely:

That the Full Council be recommended to agree that the Mayor's allowance be set at £6,361 per annum and the Deputy Mayor's allowance be set at £954 per annum for 2022/23.

The amendment was seconded and supported by Councillor Jhans.

A single debate occurred on both the recommendation and the proposed amendment. Councillors C Mullins, Crow, S. Mullins, Millar-Smith and Khan all spoke during the debate.

Following the conclusion of the debate, Councillor Lanzer in the Chair, following a request for a recorded on the proposed amendment, invited the Democratic Services Manager to commence the recorded voting process.

A recorded vote was then called on the Labour Amendment to Recommendation 1.

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (21)
14 July 2021

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, Buck, Fiveash, Irvine, Jhans, Khan, Jones, Lunnon, C Mullins, S Mullins, Nawaz, Pickett, Raja and P Smith (14)

Voting Against: Councillors: Ali, A Belben, T Belben, Bounds, B Burgess, R Burgess, Burrett, Crow, Eade, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Millar-Smith, Morris, Mwagale, Peck, Pendlington and Piggott (18)

Abstentions: Councillors: None (0)

Councillor Lanzer in the Chair declared the Amendment had fallen – votes in favour 14, and votes against 18 with 0 abstention.

Councillor Lanzer in the Chair then called for a vote on the substantive Recommendation 2 – Further Deliberations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Mayoral Allowances 2021/22 and 2022/23).

Councillor Lanzer in the Chair declared that the Recommendation 1 was approved – votes in favour 18, votes against 13 and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves that the Mayor's Allowance be set at £6,361 per annum and the Deputy Mayor's Allowance be set at £954 per annum for 2021/22 (to commence on 1 August 2021) and 2022/23.

8. **Financial Outturn 2020-2021: Budget Monitoring - Quarter 4 - (Recommendation 3)**

The Full Council considered report [FIN/526](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance which had been previously considered by the Cabinet on 30 June 2021 and Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 28 June 2021. Councillor Lamb, as the Leader of the Council, presented the report and recommendations, which sets out a summary of the Council's actual revenue and capital spending for the financial year to March 2021. It identifies the main variations from the approved spending levels and any potential impact on future budgets. The report also gives an update of useable reserves.

Councillor Crow also spoke on the item and the recommendation.

Councillor Lamb moved the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Fiveash.

RESOLVED

That Full Council approves:

- a) to increase the capital budget for purchase of temporary accommodation from £1.1m to £2.4m to be funded from specific homelessness grants, revenue and earmarked reserves for purchase of such properties.
- b) to the transfers of reserves as outlined in section 9 of this report [FIN/526](#).

9. Notification of Decisions Protected from Call-In (Recommendation 4)

The Leader, Councillor Lamb introduced the item, which was set out on page 3 of the Full Council agenda and on page 11 in the Supplementary Agenda Order Paper that the Chief Executive on three occasions has had to use under the Urgent Action decision making powers set out in the Constitution, and also protected from Call-In (in accordance with Call-In Procedure Rule 8).

The first decision, which was taken on 5 May 2021, was to agree the District Heat Network's Heat Tariff. The second decision, which was taken on 13 May 2021, was to agree that an additional discretionary Council Tax discount of up to £150 per household may be provided for working age Council Tax reduction claimants. The third and most recent was taken on 10 July 2021 was to agree the allocation of Contain Outbreak Management Government Funding (COMF) of £642,362.

Councillor Lamb moved the recommendation, which was seconded by the Councillor Fiveash.

RESOLVED

The Full Council is requested to note the use of the Protection from Call-In provision by the Chief Executive in respect of the decisions taken by the Chief Executive relating to the District Heat Network's Heat Tariff and Additional Discretionary Council Tax Discount and Contain Outbreak Management Funding which were taken on 5 May 2021, 13 May 2021, and 10 July 2021 respectively.

10. Notice of Motion 1 (Labour) - Motion amending the requirements of a Procedural Motion

The proposed Notice of Motion 1 (Labour) - Motion amending the requirements of a Procedural Motion, was withdrawn in advance of the meeting and therefore the proposal was not discussed.

11. Notice Of Motion 2 (Labour) - The Council's Response To The Boundary Commission For England

The Council considered the Notice of Motion 2 - '*The Council's response to the Boundary Commission for England*' as set out on 89 of the Full Council's agenda. The Motion was moved and presented by Councillor Lamb in do so gave further explanation behind the reasoning behind the Notice of Motion. Councillor P Smith then seconded it and spoke in support.

Councillors Crow and McCarthy also spoke in support of the Motion.

The Mayor then called for the vote on the Notice of Motion, which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

On 8 June, the Boundary Commission for England set out their draft boundary proposals for Parliamentary constituencies at the next General Election.

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (23)
14 July 2021

The draft proposals would see Crawley's Parliamentary constituency boundaries remain coterminous with those of the local authority. This is something the commission actively seeks to achieve, where population sizes make it possible, as it is recognised that local authority areas represent established communities and coterminosity enables better coordination and representation to address residents' issues between the tiers.

District and Borough Councils are responsible for administering all elections held within their areas, meaning reviews of other tiers of government relate to the business of this Council.

With a deadline to respond of the 2 August, this is the Council's last opportunity to comment before the deadline.

Crawley Borough Council approve and requests that the Electoral Services Manager submits a report to the commission expressing the council's support for the proposed boundaries for Crawley and setting out a case for their continued adoption.

12. Councillors' Questions Time

Name of Councillor asking Question	Name of Cabinet Member Responding
Councillor Crow to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability	Councillor Jhans, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability
<i>There has been a redesign of the patch teams and we were informed that this would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of grass cutting. It could be argued that every area across the town has not seen an improvement in the cutting of the grass verges, particularly throughout the summer. How much of a success has the redesign of the patch teams been?</i>	<i>Thank you, Councillor Crow for your question. The first thing I would say with regards to the grass cutting programme is to stress how severe the weather has been. The programme is dependent on the weather and having favourable ground conditions and this year has been extreme with the grass growing a lot faster. Cutting has been a challenge but I can assure you that the teams have been out doing the best they can and working as quickly as possible to get around the 2 million m² in the borough. I understand your concerns around the recent restructure and the grass cutting schedule but there is no evidence to suggest the two matters are linked. The frontline staffing levels are unchanged, and the patches are based on number of acres, shrub beds and level of demand generated. The teams are slowly catching up with the grass cutting.</i>
<i>Thank you for your answer. Interesting you mention the different size of the patches. I did hear from a colleague that</i>	<i>As far as I'm aware the teams try to be as fair and equitable in terms of the grass cutting. There will be some areas that do</i>

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (24)
14 July 2021

<p><i>if an area received more complaints, they would receive greater attention and greater frequency of grass cutting. I understand the issue of the weather as this has happened in previous years.</i></p>	<p><i>have more cuts than others for safety reasons due to sight lines.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Lunnon to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>The England football team were led very ably by Gareth Southgate, former Crawley resident, and I wanted to ask the Leader how the Council could recognise this fantastic achievement and also whether he agrees with me that he's led a team that's been at the forefront of leading the fight against bigotry, homophobia and racism and showing leadership on that, that's been somewhat lacking.</i></p> <p><i>I welcome the Leader's answer and I would like to mention that Crawley Athletics Club has someone going to the Olympics as a relay team member, Nicholas Baker.</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb, Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>Thank you. It's not only what the team have achieved on the field that is impressive, it's the way they've gone about it. Had they won, they were going to give their money to the NHS, they've repeated stood up against comments and they have gone out of their way to support those on the hardest of incomes which has shown a team that is genuinely concerned for its country, not just when they're playing with the 'Lions' on their shirt.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of whether we should recognise the achievements of Gareth Southgate, I'm forming a Cabinet Sub-group, of myself, the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability who is responsible for naming various aspects of the town and Cabinet Member for Wellbeing who is responsible for much of the town's leisure facilities. These are those who able to take the decisions on these various aspects so we will consult together, along with the Leader of the Opposition prior to any formal announcement being made. This does not necessarily mean calls for a statue will be fulfilled as we've seen previously where these have not lived up to expectations and we will only be criticised for spending money unwisely. But it is important to honour his achievements and recognise that this town has so much going for it. We will go away and come back with a recommendation in due course.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Burrett to the Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p><i>You will recall a couple of Full Council meetings last year, you asked a series of questions about the existence or otherwise of a series of emails that may</i></p>	<p>Councillor Fiveash, Cabinet Member for Fiveash</p> <p><i>That's a good question, there were several. Emails sent internally within groups, even though council systems are not obtainable through FOI, and I was not</i></p>

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (25)
14 July 2021

<p><i>or may not have been sent by the Leader of the Council within the Labour Group and other people. Now the situation has changed, and you're now Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with responsible for Freedom of Information and FOI requests, have you now received an answer that you are now satisfied with?</i></p> <p><i>Are you admitting you may have wasted some of the Full Council's time when there may have been more pressing issues to deal with?</i></p>	<p><i>entitled to them. The process was perfectly legal, and officers were correct in following the law.</i></p> <p><i>No, I wouldn't describe it as a waste of time as it was a request for information. But at the end of the day, you just have to move forward.</i></p>
<p>Councillor A Belben to the Chair of Licensing Committee</p> <p><i>The committee includes I'm sure some new and experienced members. Licensing is a very important committee, and people's livelihoods are often at stake and there is important business within a licensing committee coming up. Are you satisfied that all licensing committee members are trained?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jaggard, Chair of Licensing Committee</p> <p><i>We do have some important business coming up. The last couple of licencing meetings were actually training meetings. They were compulsory training for all committee members because as you say licensing is extremely important. One was looking at the taxi licensing and the other looked at alcohol and pub licensing. There are a number of complex reports coming up and we need to ensure that all councillors are fully trained as we may face legal challenges in the face of improper decisions. It was compulsory training and unfortunately of the 14 councillors that were required to attend, only 7 attended both sessions so this results in 7 fully trained councillors. Disappointedly 4 councillors failed to attend both sessions and this includes the newly elected Vice Chair and also the Deputy Leader. These sessions will need to be re-run but will be at a later date and will incur further time and cost, which is disappointing.</i></p>
<p>Councillor R Burgess to the Mayor</p> <p><i>Apologies but I did not hear whether or not you were going to formally write to Gareth Southgate congratulating him and the team on the achievements in the Euro 2020 tournament. If so, I apologise but if not, please can I urge you to do so in your formal position as Mayor on behalf of the town congratulating him and his team (both playing and non-playing) on their collective achievements.</i></p>	<p>Councillor Malik, The Mayor</p> <p><i>Thank you, Councillor Burgess, this is something we will look into.</i></p>

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (26)
14 July 2021

<p>Councillor Eade to the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing</p> <p><i>I wanted to make you aware of the state of the children's playground at the end of Ashburnham Road in Furnace Green? The ground is slippery, dangerous and the mats have grass growing through them. It was only refurbished a few years' ago but the maintenance is not being kept up to date. I have photos I can forward for information.</i></p>	<p>Councillor C Mullins, Cabinet Member for Wellbeing</p> <p><i>We have a lot of unsupervised play areas, but we have a working group to look at the urgency of different sites. Please send me the photos and site details. I will be able to investigate fully during the daytime but some of the sites are old but we do have a programme of refurbishment, but I will investigate.</i></p>
<p>Councillor B Burgess to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement</p> <p><i>At WSCC, a CRB/DBS is automatically carried out following elections, in your present Cabinet role what are your thoughts about renewing the practice here especially as we have so many new councillors?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jones, Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement</p> <p><i>I am happy to look into this matter a little further however I am personally not unhappy with the current arrangements the council has. I am aware of what WSCC has done in the past. I can re look at the process, but I am happy with the current arrangement and the council's child safeguarding policy, which was reviewed last time I was Cabinet Member and possibly more recently.</i></p>
<p>Councillor T Belben to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>We know during lockdown that lots of families have bought dogs so can you tell me please the amount of fines that have been issued in the last 6 and 12 months for dog fouling? Also do you think if dogs had to be kept on leads whilst on public pavements it would result in less fouling because they would be under control?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jhans, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>Thank you for your question. I'm afraid I don't have the figures on the number of fines and incidents, but I can send these through to you. On your point about keeping dogs on leads, I think owners need to take personal responsibility for their dogs.</i></p>
<p>Councillor S Mullins to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>Please can you tell me more about the additional funding received for the green homes grant?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jhans, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>Thank you, a successful bid has been received to extend the green homes grant, the local authority delivery scheme. This includes solar PV panels and solid wall insulation. To be eligible households</i></p>

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (27)
14 July 2021

	<i>need to have a gross annual income of £30,000 or less or have an energy efficiency score of D or lower. Letters have been issued to eligible households as well as notification via social media.</i>
Councillor Burrett to the Cabinet Member for Resources <i>There is a commercialisation seminar next week and quite a few issues raised will be pertinent to Councillor Fiveash's portfolio, relating to a lot of the internal support services and opportunities for commercialisation. I wanted to ask him as a new portfolio holder there, if he is totally on board with the council's commercialisation agenda?</i>	Councillor Fiveash, Cabinet Member for Resources <i>Yes, I'm on board with the agenda. What I don't want to see is everything else being forgotten about. I don't have an issue with the commercialisation programme as such as long as we keep our focus on the social side of what we do.</i>
Councillor Crow to the Leader of the Council <i>Does he think that Lewes is the only borough East Sussex council that is a member of the Greater Brighton Economic Board, given that Brighton is within East Sussex? Does he find it odd that Lewes is the only East Sussex council that is a member whilst we have a few West Sussex members?</i>	Councillor Lamb, Leader of the Council <i>Not necessarily, Eastbourne have been having conversations about whether it would be worthwhile signing up. If there is such strong feeling amongst so many West Sussex councils and if there's a need for a voice larger than our own current geographical footprint to make a louder voice out there to address our concerns it may be that we don't fill those current bodies to provide that voice or make a delivery in any reasonable form.</i>

13. Receiving the Minutes of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Other Committees including Items for Debate

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

RESOLVED

That the following reports be received:

Planning Committee – 6 April 2021
Planning Committee – 26 April 2021
Audit Committee – 29 April 2021
Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 7 June 2021
Governance Committee – 22 June 2021
Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 28 June 2021
Planning Committee – 29 June 2021
Cabinet – 30 June 2021

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (28)
14 July 2021

The following item which was not Full Council Recommendations was selected as Items for Debate:

Agenda Page no.	Committee/ Minute no.	Item
p.83	Cabinet 30 June 2021 (Minute 15) Conservative Group	Telford Place Development Opportunity (PART B)

14. Item for Debate - Telford Place Development Opportunity - Cabinet, 30 June 2021 (Minute 15)

Councillor Burrett explained the rationale for bringing this item for debate. It was felt it was important to bring the matter forward as it was not specifically concerning this site. The discussion held at the Overview and Scrutiny Commission had addressed the important issue of suggested inadequate parking on the site and whilst it was acknowledged the matter would be fully considered by the Planning Committee and no application had yet come forward, it was noted that there seemed to be developments being approved where the parking provision was not as high as would be expected and there was an assumption that due to the demographics that a lower parking provision may be required.

It was felt that public transport and different modes of transport were not currently realistic, and the Overview and Scrutiny discussion had led to a unanimous recommendation which whilst accepted by the Cabinet for this particular site, now raised a much larger issue of the council's parking standards. It was commented that regrettably the council had previously cut its residential improvement programme and it was hoped that future decisions would not have to be made to combat current decisions involving parking.

Councillors Lanzer, McCarthy, P Smith, T Belben also spoke on the item.

Councillor Irvine responded on this item. The planning process was driven by the Local Plan and applications would be considered by the Planning committee. However, what was deemed more important than that parking provision discussions was that there were benefits for the site for providing much needed housing in the town centre, bringing people into the town and helping out local businesses.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Full Council concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.52 pm

**S Malik
(Mayor)**

Agenda Item 3

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Full Council (29
14 July 2021

Disclosures of Interest Received

Councillor	Item and Minute	Meeting	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0548/ARM – Steers Lane, Pound Hill, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 6 April 2021	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0548/ARM – Steers Lane, Pound Hill, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 6 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2020/0548/ARM – Steers Lane, Pound Hill, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 6 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0548/ARM – Steers Lane, Pound Hill, Crawley (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 6 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Purdy	Planning application CR/2020/0719/FUL – Vanguard House & Victory House Churchill Court, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 6 April 2021	Personal interest – employed by UK Power Networks (a consultee on the application that did not provide a response)
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2020/0719/FUL – Vanguard House & Victory House Churchill Court, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 6 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2020/0719/FUL – Vanguard House & Victory House Churchill Court, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 6 April 2021	Personal Interest – a Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District

Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0602/ARM – Overline House, Crawley Station and Adjacent Highway, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0602/ARM – Overline House, Crawley Station and Adjacent Highway, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Purdy	Planning application CR/2019/0602/ARM – Overline House, Crawley Station and Adjacent Highway, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal interest – employed by UK Power Networks (a consultee on the application that did not provide a response)
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0660/FUL – Overline House, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0660/FUL – Overline House, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Purdy	Planning application CR/2019/0660/FUL – Overline House, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal interest – employed by UK Power Networks (a consultee on the application that did not provide a response)
Councillor Pickett	Planning application CR/2019/0661/FUL – Railway Footbridge, Station Way/East Park, Crawley (Minute 6)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – lives nearby to the application site

Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0155/FUL – Easistore, Maidenbower Office Park, Balcombe Road, Maidenbower, Crawley (Minute 7)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Hart	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – Secretary of Ewhurst Wood Sports and Social Club (a consultee on the application that did not provide a response)
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – Member of the Crawley Labour Supporters Club (based at a building adjacent to the application site)
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Planning Committee 26 April 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor R A Lanzer	Appointments and Membership of Scrutiny Panels - HASC (Minute 5)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 7 June 2021	Personal Interest – WSCC Cabinet Member for Public Health and Wellbeing
Councillor R A Lanzer	Appointments and Membership of	Overview and Scrutiny Commission	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC

Agenda Item 3

	Scrutiny Panels - JSSG (Minute 5)	7 June 2021	
Councillor A Nawaz	Appointments and Membership of Scrutiny Panels - Council-Owned Neighbourhood Parades Scrutiny Panel (Minute 5)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 7 June 2021	Personal Interest – CBC Parade Tenant/Shop Owner
Councillor Flack	Further Deliberations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Mayoral Allowances 2021/22 and 2022/23) (Minute 7)	Governance Committee 22 June 2021	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as she is the current Deputy Mayor. Councillor Flack left the room for this item and took no part in the discussion or voting on the matter.
Councillor Lamb	Further Deliberations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Mayoral Allowances 2021/22 and 2022/23) (Minute 7)	Governance Committee 22 June 2021	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as his partner is the current Deputy Mayor. Councillor Lamb left the room for this item and took no part in the discussion or voting on the matter.
Councillor Malik	Further Deliberations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Mayoral Allowances 2021/22 and 2022/23) (Minute 7)	Governance Committee 22 June 2021	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as he is the current Mayor. Councillor Malik left the room for this item and took no part in the discussion or voting on the matter.
Councillor S Piggott	Temporary Accommodation Modular Housing Solution (Minute 8)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 28 June 2021	Personal Interest – Trustee for local Housing Association but this Association has not been involved in the current item.
Councillor S Piggott	Telford Place Development Opportunity (Minute 10)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 28 June 2021	Personal Interest – Trustee for local Housing Association but this Association

			has not been involved in the current item.
Councillor R A Lanzer	HASC (Minute 11)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 28 June 2021	Personal Interest – WSCC Cabinet Member for Public Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2021/0248/FUL – The Base, Fleming Way, Northgate (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 29 June 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0248/FUL – The Base, Fleming Way, Northgate (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 29 June 2021	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0248/FUL – The Base, Fleming Way, Northgate (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 29 June 2021	Personal Interest – Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District and Chair of the Micropark Committee.
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0287/FUL – Car Park Adjacent to Co-Op, 6 Maidenbower Square, Maidenbower (Minute 5)	Planning Committee 29 June 2021	Personal Interest – Member of and councillor for the Labour and Co- operative Party (of which the Co-op supermarket is a supporter).
Councillor P Smith	Replacement Article 4 Directions for Main Employment Areas (Class MA) (Minute 12)	Cabinet 30 June 2021	Personal Interest – As Councillor P Smith is the Council's representative to the Town Centre BID Board
Councillor Crow	Notice Of Motion 2 – The Council's Response To The Boundary Commission For England (BCE)	Full Council 14 July 2021 Agenda item 9	Personal Interest – Chairman of the WSCC Electoral Review Panel. Who met to form the WSCC view on the BCE proposals including Crawley's Parliamentary boundary

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Petition - *"On the closure and change of use for the Millpond site at Bewbush and the site at Cherry Lane, Langley Green"*

LDS/174

The Council's Petition Officer

This item seeks consideration of a petition, submitted via change.org and in a CSV format, received by the Council's Petitions Officer. From 4124 signatures submitted, approximately 1950 were valid signatures, namely people who live, work or study within the Borough. As change.org, unlike the Council's own e-petition function, only allowed signatories to show their address/postcode, this is the only factor that can be used to see if the signatories have met the criteria, namely that they should live within the Borough. As the petition has received over 1000 signatures, it will go to Full Council for members' consideration at their meeting on 20 October 2021.

In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, the Full Council has a maximum of 30 minutes at each meeting to consider petitions. Within this time the Principal Petitioner will be given five minutes to present the petition to the Council and the remaining time will be for the Council to consider the petition.

The Petition, submitted by the Principal Petitioner Natalie Campbell *"On the closure and change of use for the Millpond site at Bewbush and the site at Cherry Lane, Langley Green"*, states as follows *"Please find attached the completed petition representing people's views regarding the closure and change of use for both the Millpond site at Bewbush and the site at Cherry Lane, Langley Green"*

The Petition above relates to two of the town's Adventure Playgrounds and the decision to close one (Millpond) and convert the other (Cherry Lane) to an unsupervised play area. This decision was made by [Full Council](#) on 24 February 2021 as part of the identified savings contained within report [FIN/514 – 2021/22 Budget and Council Tax](#). This report had been previously been considered at Cabinet (3 February 2021) and at Overview and Scrutiny Commission (1 February 2021).

A petition – *"Save Crawley's Adventure Playgrounds"* [HCS/26](#) was also considered at the same three meetings in February 2021. It should be noted that, in line with the Council's Petitions Scheme as set out in the Constitution, the current petition has been accepted as it has been 6 months since the previous petition was considered by the Council.

Full Council is asked to consider the petition and decide whether or not to make further recommendations. Full Council was the decision maker regarding the changes to the Adventure Playgrounds, as a clearly identifiable saving within the Budget setting report. Therefore, it will retain decision making power in respect of this petition.

The Principal Petitioner will receive written confirmation of the outcome. The confirmation will also be published on our website. Full Council decisions (relating to petitions) which are not unanimous require a recorded votes.

Agenda Item 6

RECOMMENDATION

Full Council is recommended to:

1. Receive the contents of the petition and the views expressed by the Principal Petitioner.
2. Decide which of the following options to take (noting that any such recommendation **must** be formally moved and seconded):
 - a) Note the petition without making any recommendations to change the decision made by the Full Council on 24 February 2021.
 - b) Note the petition and invite the Cabinet (at its meeting on 24 November 2021) to consider whether it wishes to bring forward viable options (including any financial implications) in relation to the closure and / or change of use of the Millpond and / or Cherry Lane Adventure Playground sites for consideration by the Full Council at its next meeting on 14 December 2021.
 - c) Support the petition and request that the Cabinet (at its meeting on 24 November 2021) bring forward viable options (including any financial implications) in relation to the closure and / or change of use of the Millpond and / or Cherry Lane Adventure Playground sites to be put before the Full Council at its next meeting on 14 December 2021 for its consideration.
 - d) Make any other recommendations relating to the petition to the Full Council for its consideration.

Agenda Item 7

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

Appendix

- 7 a) Audit Committee – 19 July 2021 (*page 27*)
- 7 b) Planning Committee – 20 July 2021 (*page 33*)
- 7 c) Planning Committee – 31 August 2021 (*page 47*)
- 7 d) Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 6 September 2021 (*page 51*)
- 7 e) Cabinet – 8 September 2021 (*page 59*)
- 7 f) Licensing Committee – 13 September 2021 (*page 65*)
- 7 g) Governance Committee – 21 September 2021 (*page 69*)
- Recommendation 1 – Review of May 2021 Polling Arrangements – (Minute 7, page 70)***
- 7 h) Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 27 September 2021 (*page 77*)
- 7 i) Cabinet – 29 September 2021 (*page 83*)

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Audit Committee

Monday, 19 July 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

J Millar-Smith (Chair)

M Flack (Vice-Chair)

M L Ayling, T G Belben, D Crow and K Khan

Also in Attendance:

Councillor R D Burrett

Observing

Elizabeth Jackson

Associate Partner, Ernst and Young

Officers Present:

Gillian Edwards

Audit and Risk Manager

Karen Hayes

Head of Corporate Finance

Mez Matthews

Democratic Services Officer

Stuart Small

Deputy Fraud Manager

Apologies for Absence:

Chris Corker

Operational Benefits and Corporate Fraud Manager

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 29 April 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. Public Question Time

No questions were asked by members of the public.

4. Fraud and Investigation Team Report

The Committee considered report [FIN/530](#) of the Operational Benefits and Corporate Fraud Manager, which focused on activity for the period from 17 February 2021 to 6 July 2021. The report was presented by the Investigations Officer on behalf of the Operational Benefits and Corporate Fraud Manager. The report indicated that the Team had continued to perform successfully despite facing a considerable increase in work during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Committee was provided with details of cases investigated and the Team's investigations, whilst a discussion took place on the Team's work generally. The Committee sought and received clarification on a number of points raised, including the work undertaken with regard to Business Grants and the method of identifying potentially fraudulent claims for Single Person Discount. In response to a query raised by a Committee Member, it was highlighted that details of fly-tipping by neighbourhood were provided to Councillors recently via email. The Chair requested that, for future reports, the table which detailed the number of cases being undertaken for each case type (Paragraph 5.1 of the report) also provide comparative figures from the previous activity period.

The Committee thanked officers for the work they had undertaken, especially considering the additional work created by Business Grants.

RESOLVED

That the Fraud and Investigation Team Report be noted.

5. Progress Report and Risk Management

The Committee considered report [FIN/529](#) of the Audit and Risk Manager. The purpose of the report was primarily to update the Committee on the progress made towards the completion of the 2021/2022 Audit Plan, and to report on the progress made in implementing the previous recommendations. The report also included an update on the Council's Strategic Risks.

The Committee discussed and noted all the Audit Plan Reviews in progress, along with other work as detailed in the report. The Audit and Risk Manager informed the Committee that additional work had recently been included to their remit, such as complaints and data breaches. The Audit and Risk Manager took the opportunity brief the Committee on the work as detailed in the report and, in relation to the following areas, the Committee:

Work Completed in the Current Period:

- Requested that in future the table set out in Paragraph 4.1 of the report, which identified work completed since the last report, be amended to differentiate more clearly between the various audit assurance levels.

Progress Report (Appendix A to the report):

- Were informed that Crawley Council had ceased to provide an Audit service for Mid Sussex District Council on 31 March 2021. That had enabled the Audit and Risk Manager's team to undertake the additional work set out in the report.

High Priority Findings (Fleet Management Audit 2020/2021):

- Were provided with further information relating to the Audit and its findings.

Follow Up Audit (Car Parking Permit Audit 2020/2021):

- Were advised that changes were in the process of being implemented and that, once further work had been undertaken by the Audit Team, it was anticipated that the outcome would be reported at the next meeting of the Audit Committee.
- Praised officers for identifying the potential issue and investigating the matter further.

The Committee discussed the update provided on Strategic Risk Management. Following queries from the Committee relating to the following areas, the Committee:

New Town Hall (Risk Register attached as Appendix B to the report):

- Were provided with more details relating to the risk levels and noted that any risk below a level 10 was not considered a concern (as set out in the risk scoring table provided on page 39 of the Agenda Pack). Any risk identified as being above level 10 would result in investigating further mitigations.

Organisational Capacity, Recruitment, Retention and Succession Planning:

- Noted that the Council was recruiting several new staff members at apprentice level, in whom the Council would invest. That process would enable to Council to 'grow its own' talent.
- Acknowledged that recruitment, particularly that of finance and legal staff, was not specific to Crawley Council and was an issue for Local Authorities nationally.

Following a request from several members of the Committee, the Head of Corporate Finance agreed to arrange some training prior to the next Committee meeting. In addition, further detail on the Audit Committee in general would be circulated via email to all Committee Members.

RESOLVED

That the Committee receive the report and note progress to date, as at 30 June 2021.

6. Audit and Risk Manager's Annual Report 2020/2021

The Committee considered report [FIN/528](#) of the Audit and Risk Manager.

The Committee acknowledged that the Annual Report had been produced in accordance with the requirements set out in the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards. The Audit and Risk Manager considered that in their overall opinion, for the period in question, "substantial" assurance could be given that there was generally a sound system of internal control designed to meet the Council's objectives, and that the controls were generally being applied consistently.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Audit and Risk Manager / Head of Corporate Finance:

- Provided an overview of the risk management approach adopted by the Council and assured the Committee that the current Risk Management Strategy, although adopted in 2015, remained valid. Following a request

from the Committee, the Head of Corporate Finance committed to reviewing that Strategy during the 2021/2022 financial year.

- Provided further information on how any risks, identified via an Audit, were graded as either low, medium or high.
- Explained the process for drafting the Internal Audit Plan and the factors considered when deciding which Audits should be undertaken.
- Gave more detail on the two frauds identified in Paragraph 8.3 of the report and outlined the systems implemented as a result of those isolated incidents.
- Explained the reasons for the Treasury Management Audit's "satisfactory" assurance and assured the Committee that the "substantial" assurance, usually afforded to the Treasury Management Audit, was expected for future Audits.
- Clarified the difference between a "satisfactory" and "substantial" assurance.
- Informed the Committee that the Audit and Risk Manager undertook a quality review of draft audit reports and working papers before an Audit report was shared with the relevant department.

RESOLVED

That the Audit and Risk Manager's Annual Report for the period 2020/2021 be noted.

7. Provisional Audit Planning Report for Year Ending 31 March 2021

The Committee considered the Provisional Audit Planning Report for the year ended 31 March 2021 which was included as [Enclosure 8](#) to the agenda. The report set out the proposed audit approach and scope for the 2020/21 audit and summarised the external Auditors' (Ernst and Young LLP) initial assessment of the key risks driving the development of an effective audit from the Council as well as the planned audit strategy in response to those risks. The Associate Partner of Ernst and Young highlighted that the planning procedures were ongoing, specifically in relation to the new requirements for the value for money conclusion.

The Associate Partner of Ernst and Young gave the Committee an overview of the Provisional Audit Planning Report and explained that it would not be possible to complete its audit of the Council's financial statements by the 30 September 2021, as previously intended, due to the increased level of work and scoping involved. It was therefore suggested that the Audit Committee scheduled for 23 November 2021 be replaced with a meeting on 14 December 2021 to allow the Statement of Accounts to be signed by the end of the calendar year.

The Committee considered matters raised, and in doing so:

- Was informed that Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) had not yet approved the fee scale for 2019/20, the Committee would be provided with a further update at its next scheduled meeting.
- Acknowledged that the report before it was provisional and, as such, an updated addendum on any new risks would be brought to a future Committee meeting. The Committee was being requested to receive and note the Audit Planning Report as it stood.
- The audit risks and areas of focus (set out on pages 53-55 of the Agenda Pack) were those which Ernst and Young were aware of or had identified as a potential risk. The Committee's attention was drawn to the two "fraud risks" and the "significant risk" detailed on page 53 of the Agenda Pack) and that Ernst and Young did not feel able to provide an audit opinion on those issues at the present time.

- The Committee continued to express its concern at the revised proposed fee scale. The Associate Partner for Ernst and Young explained that the professional and regulatory requirements had changed significantly from previous years which had increased the level of work which needed to be undertaken by them.
- The Chair informed the Committee that they would again be writing to Ernst and Young and the PSAA to echo the Committee's dismay at the significant increase in fees and to request specific information be provided which justified the fee increase.
- Noted that the Head of Corporate Finance and the Associate Partner for Ernst and Young would be working together to complete the audit as efficiently as possible.

RESOLVED

1. The Provisional Audit Planning Report for Year Ending 31 March 2021 be received and noted.
2. The Audit Committee scheduled for 23 November 2021 be replaced with a meeting on 14 December 2021 to allow the Statement of Accounts to be signed by the end of the calendar year.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Audit Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.49 pm

**J Millar-Smith
(Chair)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Tuesday, 20 July 2021 at 6.30 pm

Councillors Present:

R D Burrett (Chair)

Z Ali, M L Ayling, A Belben, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, S Malik, M Mwagale, S Raja and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Valerie Cheesman	Principal Planning Officer
Siraj Choudhury	Head of Legal, Governance and HR
Mez Matthews	Democratic Services Officer
Jean McPherson	Group Manager (Development Management)
Chris Pedlow	Democratic Services Manager
Marc Robinson	Principal Planning Officer
Clem Smith	Head of Economy and Planning
Jess Tamplin	Democratic Services Support Officer

Also in Attendance:

Councillors B J Burgess, R G Burgess, K Khan and P K Lamb

1. Disclosures of Interest

The following disclosures of interests were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor Ayling	Planning application CR/2018/0064/FUL – Land Parcel Broadwood Rise, Broadfield, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – member of staff at the Bewbush Academy (in close proximity to the application site).
Councillor Burrett	Planning application CR/2018/0064/FUL – Land Parcel Broadwood Rise, Broadfield, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal interest – member of West Sussex County Council and Chair of the Planning and Rights of Way Committee.

Agenda Item 7 Appendix b

Planning Committee
20 July 2021

Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2018/0064/FUL – Land Parcel Broadwood Rise, Broadfield, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2018/0064/FUL – Land Parcel Broadwood Rise, Broadfield, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).
Councillor A Belben	Planning application CR/2020/0676/FUL – 71a Three Bridges Road, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal Interest – the agent was previously employed by Cllr Belben regarding a planning application made in 2019.
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2021/0247/FUL – The Office, Crawley Business Quarter, Manor Royal, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal Interest – member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0247/FUL – The Office, Crawley Business Quarter, Manor Royal, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal Interest – member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0247/FUL – The Office, Crawley Business Quarter, Manor Royal, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal Interest – Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District.
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2021/0308/ARM – 42 & 44 Brighton Road, Southgate, Crawley (Minute 7)	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing.
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2021/0249/ARM – Former GSK Manor Royal, Telecon Metals & Carpenters Technology Site, Napier Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0249/ARM – Former GSK Manor Royal, Telecon Metals & Carpenters Technology Site, Napier Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – member of Crawley Walking and Cycle Forum (a consultee on the application).

Councillor P
Smith

Planning application
CR/2021/0249/ARM – Former
GSK Manor Royal, Telecon
Metals & Carpenters
Technology Site, Napier Way,
Northgate, Crawley
(Minute 8)

Personal Interest – Local Authority
Director of the Manor Royal
Business Improvement District.

2. Lobbying Declarations

The following lobbying declarations were made by councillors:-

Councillors Ali, A Belben, Burrett, Irvine, Jaggard, Malik, Mwagale, Raja, and P Smith had been lobbied regarding application CR/2018/0064/FUL.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 29 June 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Planning Application CR/2018/0064/FUL - Land Parcel Broadwood Rise, Broadfield, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/373a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Erection of primary school with associated parking and landscaping (amended description and amended plans received).

Councillors Ali, A Belben, Burrett, Irvine, Jaggard, Malik, Mwagale, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (MR) provided a verbal summation of the application which sought permission for the development of a two storey primary school adjacent to the existing Mosque building. The Committee heard that, since the publication of the report, a further reason for refusal regarding biodiversity (reason 7) had been added. Further representations had also been received including from H Smith MP and Councillor P Lamb.

Brian Tully spoke in objection to the application. Matters raised included:

- The lack of need for more primary schools in Bewbush or Broadfield.
- An increase in overspill parking on to nearby roads at school pick-up and drop-off times.
- A query regarding the source of funding for the school.

Arif Syed, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The applicant strove to work constructively with the Local Planning Authority regarding the Section 106 agreement and drainage strategy but communication was unclear.
- Although six trees were proposed to be felled, 25 replacement trees were to be planted, which was deemed a positive ecological contribution.
- Building on the area of ancient woodland would have no greater detrimental impact on the land than some previous housing developments in the borough.

Mohammad Bora spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- Many students already attend the evening school operating at the Mosque without any shortage of parking spaces. The school was not proposed to operate during prayer time on Fridays, when the Mosque was busiest.
- The overspill of approximately 25 cars at peak times due to a loss of car parking spaces, as predicted in the report, was contested.
- Faith schools encouraged high educational achievement.

Mohammad Jogee spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- Residents had expressed a need for a local Islamic faith school as the closest was currently 20 to 30 miles away. There were a number of existing Christian faith schools in the Crawley area.
- The proposed school was to be community-funded – no public money was to be used.
- The school aimed to promote community integration.

Councillor Kiran Khan, on behalf of Councillor Tim Lunnon (ward councillor for Broadfield), spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- An adjustment had been made to the Mosque's prayer times on Fridays, leading to decreased traffic and in turn greater availability of parking spaces.
- West Sussex County Council's Highways Department had retracted its objection to the development.
- The positive responses from Broadfield residents regarding the plans.

Councillor Khan (ward councillor for Broadfield) also showed support for the application and commented that there was a definite need for the school.

Councillor Peter Lamb spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- A need to balance the various elements of the application based on policies, and preclude those matters not forming relevant planning considerations. On this basis it was deemed correct to permit the application.
- The lack of a 15 metre buffer zone between the development and the ancient woodland was a reason for refusal in the report; however the existing buffer between the area and the Mosque/nearby housing was smaller than this.
- Concerns over parking were regarding overspill from the Mosque, not parking at the school itself.

The Committee then considered the application.

Upon receipt of a query from a Committee member, the Planning Officer clarified that the proposed development was sited within an area of ancient woodland but the majority of the trees had been cleared from the site. A 15 metre buffer zone bordering the remaining woodland to the west was required however no buffer zone was proposed, so the proposal was not policy-compliant in this regard. Several Committee members expressed concerns regarding the lack of a buffer zone and that the woodland should be protected from damage during and after construction. Other Committee members queried the need for a buffer zone as the existing Mosque car park did not have this. The Planning Officer stated that the proposal's relationship with the woodland was different to that with the Mosque and the use of the site as a car park, as the school was proposed to be a large structure in nearly constant use with classroom windows facing the woodland. The development required initial and future works to the trees.

A concern was raised regarding the distance to neighbouring houses (the closest house was situated 23 metres away). The Planning Officer confirmed that the

recommended distance was 30 metres, however in this instance there was an intervening road already accessible by the public and no direct overlooking, so the distance was acceptable.

Committee members sought clarification regarding the Local Plan designation of the site, which was confirmed to be within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area, an area of Ancient Woodland, and formed part of the area's structural landscaping.

The Committee discussed the refusal reason regarding flooding and a suggestion was made that this could be controlled by conditions. The Planning Officer explained that a Surface Water Drainage Strategy had been submitted, but had not sufficiently evidenced that the proposal would not increase off-site flooding.

The loss of six protected trees at the site was discussed. Committee members discussed the trees' health – two of which were damaged – and expressed mixed views about their existing amenity value. The proposal to plant 25 replacement trees was generally deemed a positive aspect of the application, however some Committee members had concerns that the replacement trees were not of high amenity value.

Mixed views were expressed regarding parking at the site. The Planning Officer confirmed that the parking proposed at the site was sufficient for the school, but the development would result in a loss of existing spaces by the Mosque as the school would be located on the overflow car park. This could in turn lead to overspill on to surrounding roads which currently experienced parking issues at peak operation times at the Mosque. Several Committee members suggested that the proposed parking situation was manageable.

Queries were raised about the discussions with the applicant regarding a Section 106 agreement. The Planning Officer confirmed that if the application were to be permitted, a Section 106 agreement would be required. It was clarified that the refusal reason to ensure the provision of off-site infrastructure works required by WSCC was required if there was a potential appeal.

It was confirmed that the applicant and the Local Planning Authority had worked to try to address various issues with the application but further information, such as responses to re-consultations, were received at a late stage in the process.

Other matters discussed were the provision of outside amenity space, underground parking, and the Travel Plan.

It was requested by Councillor Irvine that a recorded vote be taken on the application. The names of the Committee members voting for, against, or abstaining were as follows:

For the recommendation to refuse: Councillors Ayling, A Belben, Burrett, Irvine, and Jaggard (5).

Against the recommendation to refuse: Councillors Ali, Malik, Mwagale, Raja, and P Smith (5).

Abstentions: none.

The Chair's casting vote was used. The vote was cast for the recommendation to refuse.

RESOLVED

Refuse for the reasons set out in report PES/373a, and further refusal reason 7 as follows:

7. The development would not provide any net gain in biodiversity or enhance features of nature conservation value within and around the site contrary to Policy ENV2 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Planning Application CR/2020/0676/FUL - 71a Three Bridges Road, Three Bridges, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/373b](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Erection of first floor extension and new roof to convert bungalow into a two storey dwelling.

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

The Principal Planning Officer (VC) provided a verbal summation of the application which proposed an upward extension to a residential property. It was heard that the scale, height, bulk, and massing of the proposal, along with the inappropriate materials proposed, would be out of keeping with the nearby streetscene and refusal was therefore recommended.

Jas Saraw, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The report did not factor in the properties opposite when determining the character of the local streetscene.
- Other developments on the road were highlighted which were of a similar or larger size and bulk.
- The proposed footprint, when compared to the size of the plot, was not considered to be disproportionately large.

Councillor Bob Burgess (ward councillor for Three Bridges) spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- No objections to the proposals had been made by neighbours of the site.
- Designs submitted showed an aspirational property of a substantial size.
- If permitted, neighbours would not experience a loss of privacy.

Councillor Brenda Burgess (ward councillor for Three Bridges) spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- Other residential buildings in the locality, which were suggested to be out of character with the streetscene, had previously been granted planning permission.
- The width of the proposal was not dramatically greater than the width of the existing dwelling.
- The proposal would have no detrimental impact on parking provision.

The Committee then considered the application. The character of the streetscene along Three Bridges Road was discussed. It was suggested that, although the immediate neighbouring properties were of a different design to the proposals, there

was a mix of designs along the road and wider area. It was therefore regarded that the proposal was not out of keeping with the local streetscene.

Clarity was sought regarding the proposed increase in the size of the property. The Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal would increase the overall width of the building due to its joining with the garage, which was proposed to be moved 1m further from the property boundary. The proposed footprint was therefore larger than the existing footprint. The width of the first floor would be wider than adjacent properties and would add considerable bulk to the existing dwelling.

A vote was taken on the recommendation set out in the report, which was overturned.

The Committee discussed possible conditions to attach to the planning permission, were it to be granted.

A vote was then taken on a proposal to permit the application.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the following conditions:

1. *The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.*

REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. *The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans as listed below save as varied by the conditions hereafter:*

Drawing Number	Revision	Drawing Title
JS01		Location/Block Plan & Existing Ground Floor Elevations
CBC 0001		Block Plan
JS02	D	Proposed Plans and Elevations

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. *No development shall be carried out unless and until a schedule of materials and finishes and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, samples of such materials and finishes to be used for external walls (and roofs) of the proposed building(s) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.*

REASON: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity by endeavouring to achieve a building of visual quality in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

4. *The bathroom window on the first floor side (east) elevation of the dwelling shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and apart from any top-hung vent, be fixed to be permanently non-opening.*

REASON: To protect the amenities and privacy of the adjoining property, in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

5. *No windows (other than those shown on the plans hereby approved) shall be constructed in the side (east and west) elevations of the extension hereby permitted which adjoins the side boundaries with no.71 and no.73 Three Bridges Road without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority on an application in that behalf.*

REASON: To protect the amenities and privacy of the adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

6. The hardstanding area / driveway to the front of the site shall be kept available for parking of 2 vehicles at all times.

REASON: To ensure adequate provision of parking for the dwelling clear of the highway in accordance with Policies CH3 and IN4 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030, and the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2016).

7. The development shall not be occupied until the measures detailed in the submitted Sustainability Statement have been implemented or otherwise in accordance with details which have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of environmental sustainability, in accordance with policy ENV6 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and the Planning and Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document.

8. Prior to the installation of new showers, sinks and other water consuming components within the development, details of their water consumption levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The components shall subsequently be installed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To help address water stress in Crawley in the interests of sustainability and in accordance with policies ENV6 and ENV9 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and the Planning and Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document.

Informative

1. The applicant is advised that the Local Planning Authority considers that the details submitted to comply with condition 8 of this permission should, where feasible, demonstrate that the water consumption levels of new components fitted within the building should achieve the performance levels set out in Table 8.1 on page 48 of the Planning and Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document available at: <https://crawley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/PUB279782.pdf>.

NPPF Statement

In determining this planning application, the Local Planning Authority assessed the proposal against all material considerations and has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions where possible and required, by:

- Liaising with the applicant/agent and discussing the proposal where considered appropriate and necessary in a timely manner during the course of the determination of the application.*
- Seeking amended plans/additional information to address identified issues during the course of the application.*

This decision has been taken in accordance with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework, as set out in article 35, of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.

6. Planning Application CR/2021/0247/FUL - The Office, Crawley Business Quarter, Manor Royal, Northgate, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/373c](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Demolition of existing building and associated structures and redevelopment for storage and distribution warehouse within use class B8.

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

The Principal Planning Officer (VC) provided a verbal summation of the application which sought permission for the construction of a warehouse for business use in the Manor Royal Business Improvement District. The Committee heard that, since the publication of the report, further discussions between relevant parties had led to amendments proposed to conditions 7, 14, 22, and 24, and the addition of new informatives 7 and 8. The revised air quality assessment was considered acceptable with the revised costs of £47,000 and the corresponding level of mitigation measures were to be secured via the Section 106 agreement.

Eric Hall, the agent (TDH Estates) on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The suitability of the scheme for the intended user, which would allow for increased capacity and the creation of jobs.
- The proposed landscaping and additional trees to be planted at the site.
- Elements of the scheme were designed to meet BREEAM 'excellent' standard including water consumption, energy usage, PV panels, and electric vehicle charging points.

The Committee then considered the application. The officer confirmed that the proposed parking provision exceeded the borough parking standards, and that parking and access were to be controlled by conditions. A travel plan was also required of the applicant which would cover staff vehicles and business vehicles and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.

A query was raised regarding the suitability of B8 use buildings at the proposed location. The officer clarified that there were not designations or limitations for specific use classes in certain areas of Manor Royal. As the scheme was for business use the location within the Manor Royal Employment Area was appropriate and policy compliant.

The officer confirmed that air source heat pumps would form the main heating and cooling system within the building. There was also provision for a potential future connection to the Crawley District Heat Network included in the design.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the conditions set out in report PES/373c and the amended conditions and additional informatives as follows:

Amended conditions

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Travel Plan ref 2021/5819/TP02 dated July 2021 submitted with the application. Only the approved details shall be implemented.

REASON: To encourage and promote sustainable transport in accordance with Policy IN3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2030.

14. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Landscape Design Strategy dated 01.07.2021 and the Landscape Strategy Masterplan, Drawing No. LLD2252-LAN-DWG-010 Rev 04 submitted with the application.

The approved details of the landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. No subsequent alterations to the approved landscaping scheme are to take place unless submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development and to avoid endangering the safe movement of aircraft and the operation of Gatwick Airport through the attraction of birds and an increase in the bird hazard risk of the application site in accordance with Policies CH3 and IN1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2030.

22. Immediately following demolition of the existing building and prior to any further construction works, a strategy to deal with the potential risks associated with any contamination of the site (as set out within the Phase I Desk Study Report Contaminated Land Risk Assessment dated 11 February 2021) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This strategy will include the following components:

1) The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment and, based on these findings, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

2) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: The proposed site is on a former works/engineering/industrial ground with risk of contamination on the site and to ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution or contaminated land in accordance with Policy ENV10 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

24. No solar panels shall be installed until full details, including a solar hazard glare study if required, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No subsequent alterations to the approved scheme are to take

place unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure the development does not endanger the safe movement of aircraft or the operation of Gatwick Airport through interference with communication, navigational aids and surveillance equipment and glare issues in accordance with Policies CH3 and ENV6 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and the Planning and Climate Change SPD.

Additional informatives

7. The applicant is advised that the Crawley Business Quarter is a private road, therefore the Local Highway Authority is unable to sign off any works as they do not form part of the adopted highway network maintained or owned by WSCC. For this reason all reference to WSCC should be removed from the Road Safety Audit – Stage 1 contained within the Transport Assessment.

8. The applicant is advised that in regard to condition 14 the amount of berry/fruit bearing species proposed as part of the soft landscaping scheme does not exceed 40% of the total planting palette and is distributed across the site.

7. Planning Application CR/2021/0249/FUL - Former GSK Manor Royal, Telecon Metals & Carpenters Technology Site, Napier Way, Northgate, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/373e](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Erection of 3 warehouse units (use class B8), associated external plant, car/HGV parking, site access, internal roads, boundary security fencing and hard/soft landscaping.

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

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application which proposed three buildings for storage and distribution use at a currently vacant site within the Manor Royal Employment Area. The Committee heard that, since the publication of the report, further discussions between relevant parties had led to amendments being proposed to conditions 3, 4, 5, and 10. The Committee was also requested to delegate authority to officers to insert in to condition 20 the correct plan number once the relevant drawing was received.

Sue Willcox, the agent (Quod) on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The estimated number of jobs created by the scheme and the inclusion of a Skills and Employment Plan in the Section 106 agreement.
- The loss of 9 trees at the site, for which 47 replacement trees were proposed, alongside enhancements to biodiversity.
- Details of financial contributions to the Manor Royal BID and to enhancements to the local cycle network.

The Committee then considered the application. In response to a query regarding the parking provision for lorries at the site, the officer confirmed that lorry parking at units

two and three was slightly lower than set out in the borough parking standards, however this was deemed to be a matter for the buildings' future operator to consider. WSCC's Highways Department had no objection to the parking proposals.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the conditions set out in report PES/373e, the amended conditions set out below, and the provision of delegated authority to officers to insert the agreed plan number in to condition 20.

3. No construction work above 5m from ground level shown on the approved plans CRAW1-RPS-B1-ZZ-DR-A-5399 Rev P02, CRAW1-RPS-B2-ZZ-DR-A-5399 Rev P02 and CRAW1-RPS-B3-ZZ-DR-A-5399 P02 shall take place on site until a Radar Mitigation Scheme, including a timetable for its implementation during construction, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Radar Mitigation Scheme shall be implemented in strict accordance with the agreed details.

REASON: In the interests of the safe operation of Gatwick Airport and of NATS En-route PLC and in accordance with Policy IN1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

4. The approved cladding on the northern elevations for the three units shall not exceed 81.200 AOD (13.6m AGL) for Unit 1, 76.000 AOD (8.4m AGL) for Unit 2, or 75750 AOD (6.9m AGL) for Unit 3, as shown on approved plans CRAW1-RPS-B1-ZZ-DR-A-5399 Rev P02, CRAW1-RPS-B2-ZZ-DR-A-5399 Rev P02 and CRAW1-RPS-B3-ZZ-DR-A-5399 P02 until the Radar Mitigation Scheme detailed in condition 3 has been implemented. If Unit 1 is constructed before Unit 2, the cladding on the north elevation of Unit 1 shall not exceed 76,000 AOD(8.4m AGL) prior to the Radar Mitigation Scheme being implemented. The Radar Mitigation Scheme shall thereafter be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of the safe operation of Gatwick Airport and of NATS En-route PLC and in accordance with Policy IN1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

5. No construction work above 5m from ground level shown on the approved plans CRAW1-RPS-B1-ZZ-DR-A-5399 Rev P02, CRAW1-RPS-B2-ZZ-DR-A-5399 Rev P02 and CRAW1-RPS-B3-ZZ-DR-A-5399 P02 shall commence on site until a Crane Operation Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Construction at the site shall only thereafter take place in strict accordance with the approved Crane Operation Plan.

REASON: In the interests of the safe operation of Gatwick Airport and of NATS En-route PLC and in accordance with Policy IN1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

10. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and its Tree Protection Plan provided by Deltasimons dated March 2021, Addendum Statement issued April 2021 and Addendum Statement issued 14th July 2021 submitted with the application. The tree protection measures as set out within the report must be implemented prior to the commencement of any site works and thereafter maintained for the duration of the construction works.

REASON: To ensure that the protected trees are not compromised during the construction of the development in accordance with Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2030.

8. Planning Application CR/2021/0308/ARM - 42 & 44 Brighton Road, Southgate, Crawley

As the business of the meeting was not concluded by 11:00pm, General Committee Procedure Rule 15.4 (Planning Committee guillotine) came into effect.

Planning application CR/2021/0308/ARM (report [PES/373d](#)) was therefore deferred to the next scheduled meeting of the Committee on 31 August 2021.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 11.33 pm.

**R D Burrett
(Chair)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Tuesday, 31 August 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

R D Burrett (Chair)

S Buck (Vice-Chair)

Z Ali, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, S Malik, S Raja and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Siraj Choudhury Head of Legal, Governance and HR

Jean McPherson Group Manager (Development Management)

Jess Tamplin Democratic Services Support Officer

Hamish Walke Principal Planning Officer

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors A Belben and M Mwagale

1. Disclosures of Interest

The following disclosures of interests were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0174/FUL – Land at Faraday Road & Manor Royal, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal interest – Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District.
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2021/0308/FUL – 42 & 44 Brighton Road, Southgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal interest – Cabinet Member for Housing.

2. Lobbying Declarations

No lobbying declarations were made.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 20 July 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Planning Application CR/2021/0174/FUL - Land at Faraday Road & Manor Royal, Northgate, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/374a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Proposed demolition of existing buildings and construction of a new warehouse building with ancillary offices, associated service yard, parking, access alterations, infrastructure, landscaping and ancillary works.

Councillors Ali, Burrett, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer provided a verbal summation of the application which sought permission for the construction of a 7,399sqm warehouse for class B8 use at a site in the Manor Royal Employment Area, currently occupied by a warehouse with a larger floorspace. The Committee was updated that, since the publication of the report, further discussions with the Council's Drainage Officer had led to an amendment to condition 3 as well as an additional condition, which formed condition 22.

Richard Cotton, the applicant (Lakenorth Ltd), spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The existing warehouse was considered no longer fit for purpose. The proposed development was of a high quality design and the redevelopment would create jobs and contribute to the Manor Royal Employment Area.
- Included in the proposed design were environmentally sustainable and energy-efficient features such as solar PV panels and air source heat pumps.
- The development was policy compliant.

The Committee then considered the application.

The Committee heard that the proposed design was slightly taller and the space more uniform than the existing warehouse, which was disjointed and therefore less fit for purpose. The Officer confirmed that the total floorspace of the proposed building was 7,399sqm.

On receipt of a query regarding the Transport Assessment, the Officer confirmed that the expected reduction in vehicle movements for the proposed development was made in comparison to the existing warehouse if it were fully occupied and in use – not if it were vacant or partially vacant. The assessment was based on the building's floorspace.

Following discussion regarding parking at the site, it was heard that the overall number of proposed parking spaces met policy standards, and that it was a matter for the future operator to decide on the balance of spaces for cars, vans, and HGVs. The Officer confirmed that the parking arrangements of those vehicles using the building could only be controlled on-site.

The Committee noted that there was a shortfall in the proposed number of replacement trees to be planted. This was however to be addressed, subject to any below-ground services, by planting on the adjacent highway verge and by an off-site contribution to tree planting through the Section 106 agreement. Committee members praised the various sustainability measures included in the design.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the conclusion of a Section 106 agreement, the conditions set out in report PES/374a and amended condition 3 and additional condition 22 as follows:

3. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate, but not necessarily be restricted to, the following matters:

- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction;*
- the method of access and routing of vehicles during construction;*
- the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors;*
- the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste;*
- the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development;*
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;*
- the provision of temporary construction and security lighting;*
- the provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders);*
- details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works; and*
- details showing how surface water will be drained during the construction phase.*

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the area in accordance with policies CH3, ENV11, ENV12 and IN3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

REASON why pre-commencement condition: as it relates to potential impact upon the surrounding area starting from the setting up for construction activities and demolition.

22. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, a post construction drainage certification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall confirm that the works, including the SuDS features, proposed in the Flood Risk Assessment have been constructed as stated. This shall be carried out by a third party.

REASON: This is a major development and the performance of the drainage system must be future proofed to avoid flooding within the development and subsequent flood risk to other areas close to the development site in accordance with Policy EN8 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

5. Planning Application CR/2021/0308/ARM - 42 & 44 Brighton Road, Southgate, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/374b](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Approval of reserved matters in relation to appearance and scale pursuant to CR/2020/0588/OUT for the erection of a part 3 and part 4 storey building comprising of 5 x 1no. bedroom flats and 15 x 2no. bedroom flats, of which 2 no. will be designated as affordable housing, following the demolition of existing semi-detached dwellings, the improvement of an access from Brighton Road, the creation of a new vehicular access from Stonefield Close and associated works and landscaping.

Councillors Ali, Burrett, Jaggard, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application which related to the reserved matters (appearance and scale) following an earlier outline application for the development of 20 flats previously permitted by the Committee. The Officer updated the Committee that, since the publication of the report, there had been minor changes to the National Planning Policy Framework. A brief overview of the changes was given and it was clarified that none of these altered the application or wording in the report.

The Committee then considered the application.

Following a query from a Committee member regarding the application process, the Officer gave a summary of the planning history for the application site. It was clarified that the planning system allows for the option to submit an outline application to establish the principle of development with a reduced level of detail, ahead of a later application for approval of reserved matters. It was heard that the outline application for this development (CR/2020/0588/OUT) had covered the access and layout and agreed the affordable housing provision which was for two units.

Committee members recognised that no objections to the application before them had been made by members of the public.

RESOLVED

Approve subject to the conditions set out in report PES/374b.

Closure of Meeting

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

**R D Burrett
(Chair)**

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Monday, 6 September 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

K Khan (Vice-Chair in the Chair)

M L Ayling, R G Burgess, R A Lanzer, S Mullins, A Pendlington and S Piggott

Also in Attendance:

Councillor R D Burrett, I T Irvine, P K Lamb, C J Mullins, M Morris and M Mwagale

Officers Present:

Ian Duke	Deputy Chief Executive
Heather Girling	Democratic Services Officer
Nikki Hargrave	Housing Options Manager (Strategic Housing)
Karen Rham	Neighbourhood Services Manager
Kate Wilson	Head of Community Services
Paul Windust	Chief Accountant

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor T G Belben, A Nawaz and B A Smith

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 28 June 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Vice Chair.

3. Public Question Time

No questions from the public were asked.

4. Petition – 'Keep your dog on a lead in Tilgate Park'.

The Commission considered joint report [HCS/30](#) of the Head of Community Services and Petitions Officer.

The report responded to the petition submitted from residents titled 'Keep your dog on a lead in Tilgate Park. The petition documented the concerns and wished the council to increase signage and warden patrol around Tilgate lake to ensure dogs were kept on leads while walking around the lake and to implement the enforcement of rules when this was not adhered to:

"We the undersigned petition the council to Increase signage and warden patrol around Tilgate lake to ensure dogs are kept on leads while walking around the lake. To implement enforcement of rules are not adhered too. My dog was attacked while walking around the lake by a dog that was not kept on its lead. The rules are clear on the website, however there isn't sufficient signage and enforcement of rules for dog owners not adhering to the rules. Therefore increased presence of signage, policing and enforcement is required"

Members were informed of the key areas for consideration and recommendation within report [HCS/30](#). The report outlined the research that had been undertaken following receipt of the petition. Members considered this and the additional information.

During the discussion with the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing, the Head of Community Services and Neighbourhood Services Manager, Members made the following comments:

- It was acknowledged that the petition referred to Tilgate Park only, however it was hoped Tilgate Park could be a trial for other parks as it was not a problem confined just to one particular area within the town, as the recent dog on dog attacks in Worth Park (which unfortunately resulted in a death of a dog) and that along Worth Way were also mentioned.
- It was felt it was the responsibility of dog owners to keep their dog on a lead and to ensure it was kept under control. Acknowledgement that dogs react differently in various environments and being on a lead would be one option to assist this.
- Dogs were not allowed in the walled garden, nature centre or children's play area within Tilgate Park. The walled garden and nature centre were routinely staffed making this easier to manage and in general it was felt that the public largely complied with and respected the need to keep dogs out of the play area.
- Disappointment was expressed that the current signage within Tilgate Park had not been successful and the vandalism of signs unacceptable.
- There was acknowledgement that the enforcement options detailed in the report included by-laws, PSPOs and CPNs when officers and the police would have to actually witness the infringement and obtain sufficient evidence. These enforcement options differed to the current Community Warden patrols, which provided a visible presence challenging and encouraging owners of dogs off leads. It was noted that the park covered a huge area and it was felt by some that patrols should take place around the entire park, not just the lake.
- Recognition that as part of a communication plan there could be opportunities to focus on more than one issue. Community Wardens have a variety of work and respond geographically to multiple ASB issues including Tilgate Park. There was a good communications plan for Tilgate Park but this could be strengthened with the dogs on leads issue and it was hoped to work with a 'Friends of' group to develop the message.
- An update was provided on the 'Hound Ground' in that further work was ongoing but it was anticipated it would reopen in the future.

- It was felt the number of attacks was under reported and the public should be encouraged to report incidents.
- Recognition that the actions needed to be robust and the penalty of keeping a dog on a lead paled into insignificance when compared to a dog attack and injury inflicted. The majority of Commission members voiced a preference for option 2 within the report, expressing support for the Community Warden Patrol enforcement around the park. Whilst enforcement options were discussed at length, it was thought that option 3 may be heavily resource intensive without resulting in behavioural change and minimum reward in comparison. It was hoped that option 2 may in time be rolled out to other parks. Should the Cabinet support option 2, it was suggested that a review takes place in 6-9 months' time following the implementation to assess its operation.

RESOLVED

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

5. 2021/2022 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 1

The Commission considered report [FIN/531](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance on the quarter 1 budget monitoring, which set out a summary of the Council's actual revenue and capital spending for the quarters to June 2021 together with the main variations from the approved spending levels and impact on future budgets.

During the discussion with the Leader of the Council and Chief Accountant, the following comments were made:

- Recognition that the budget was overspent for this quarter. The majority of the reasons were still Covid related (for example people not signing up to use services following the easing of restrictions, number of planning applications received). The situation would be monitored over the next few months and continued to be reported in future monitoring reports.
- Confirmation was provided that Everyone Active had developed additional advertising campaigns to promote K2 Crawley. There may be additional ways (secondary spend) to encourage attendance at venues.
- There was a query surrounding attendance analysis at K2 Crawley. It was felt that once there was a level of normality, and if then, usage levels had not returned to pre-pandemic levels then further analysis may be required. However currently there was too much uncertainty surrounding attendance levels.
- Acknowledgement that whilst individuals' household income had been affected, leisure facilities would continue to be impacted. There was recognition that Covid had resulted in behavioural change and until there was overriding confidence that Covid would not be a concern, then leisure provision would remain a challenging area but it was hopefully not a long term issue. There was also an impact on other services throughout the town as a result of Coronavirus.
- Recognition that the council gave advice to businesses during and post pandemic as well as working in partnership with the business community and MRBD. It was also hoped that there would be further green development in the future.
- Acknowledgement that the review of essential car users' savings anticipated figure was unlikely to be realised but was based on what would be reasonable.

RESOLVED

That the 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.

6. Tilgate Park Update

The Commission received an update from the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing, the Head of Community Services and the Neighbourhood Services Manager on Tilgate Park, its business plan, impact on the Covid19 pandemic together with how the park, nature centre and staff have been affected and adapted, together with improvements, changes moving forward, future working and priorities.

- Tilgate Park introduced a 5 year business plan in 2015 where the park was encouraged to generate additional income. This included a 50p incremental charging for the Nature Centre. However from 2020, a decision was taken to introduce a step-change of £6/£5 charge respectively. It was felt the below comparisons justified the increase, however it was important to protect the income and it was hoped in the future to become cost neutral for the entire service.

August comparison		
2018	26,382 visitors	£94,000
2019	23,747 visitors	£98,000
2021	23,187 visitors	£165,000

12 April – 31 August comparison	
2018/19	£305,800
2019/20	£308,700
2020/21	£401,600 *

* opening April 2021 with limited max capacity, pre booking only

- The majority of visitors were from outside Crawley and Nature Centre bookings had increased the use of MyCrawley by 45%.
- Tilgate Park had now established itself as a regional attraction, fairly priced compared to other facilities. It had received the Parkdean, BIAZA Gold and Silver awards together with the TripAdvisor Hall of Fame Travellers' Choice, voted top 10% in the world.
- The play area within the park had recently been renovated using reserves.
- It was acknowledged that much of the work within the park took place surrounding its maintenance of the lake and horticultural within its gardens. Many of the renovated plants would be saved to replant in other areas of the park.
- The Remembrance Garden has been newly created to enable the scattering of a loved one's ashes. There is also the option to dedicate a bench, shrub or tree to someone who has passed. Pet memorials will be introduced shortly.
- Tilgate has since introduced events during the autumn/winter months to ensure the venue has events throughout the year.
- The hound ground required further work but it was anticipated it will reopen in the future.
- The Lakeside café had proven popular and developed following customer feedback.

- Weddings now take place at the park, given the park's unique location and surroundings.
- The car park issues were currently being addressed.
- It was acknowledged that further developments can be addressed sympathetically in the future to enhance the park to its full potential.

Members then raised a number of queries. The issues raised and the key responses included:

- Members expressed their congratulations at achieving international recognition.
- Confirmation that in terms of assets, it was important to look at these as an opportunity basis and evaluate accordingly. The focus currently would be on generating revenue.
- Recognition that car parking machines had posed issues during the year. A new app was being introduced in addition to the machines. Gainsborough playing fields had been used in the past for large events such as the Dragon Boat Race when it can be marshalled and stewarded.
- Acknowledgement that the children's playground renovation had been successful and there was a comment for further seating in and around the site.
- Concerns raised around the lack of pollination and drought resistance planting. It was confirmed that further sustainable, pollinated friendly planting that is drought resistant will be developed at the park
- Recognition that event organisers were encouraged to use different event spaces, playing fields and parks across the town. It was important to have a balance of events to ensure the understanding and sensitivity of residents were managed. Tilgate Park is a large park and draws the crowds.
- Recent events at Goffs Park had been successful and highlighted the use of other parks within the town.
- Officers were thanked for a great deal of work throughout the council during a difficult time over the last 18 months.

RESOLVED

That the Chair thanked the officers for the presentation and for the informative discussions that had ensured. The Commission noted the presentation, with the views expressed being acknowledged and documented by officers.

7. Cabinet Member Discussion with the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing

The Commission noted the update given by Councillor Mullins and questioned him on a variety of issues relating to his portfolio.

The following topics were discussed:

- The services within the Wellbeing portfolio were non statutory, yet it was acknowledged that they encompassed the wellbeing of the town and included elements of education and physical education for both children and adults.
- Whilst during the pandemic it had been important to keep people safe, there was a recognition that the leisure provision was challenging and there was a need to promote and encourage the use of facilities.
- Community buildings may not have deteriorated throughout the pandemic, although the cleaning routines and high standards would need to be maintained. Playing fields were being gradually improved. It was also noted that outside gyms were now proving popular.

- It was noted there used to be leisure facilities tour as this had been beneficial for the various venues and business aspects. This could be introduced depending on attendance prior to the budget process.

RESOLVED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Commission thanked Councillor Mullins for attending and for the informative discussion that had ensued.

8. 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.

9. Property Acquisition to Increase the Council's Portfolio of Temporary Accommodation

Exempt Paragraph 3

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

The Commission considered report SHAP/83 of the Head of Strategic Housing. The report sought approval to purchase a property on the open market to be used for Temporary Accommodation. The purchase will be funded through the approved budget for Temporary Accommodation.

During the discussion with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Options Manager, Councillors made the following comments:

- Recognition that the property would assist in the urgent need to increase the portfolio of temporary accommodation owned and managed by the Council to meet the increased demand and ease the reliance on expensive nightly paid accommodation, including out of borough placement.
- Acknowledgement that the detached property would provide an additional 6 units of temporary accommodation. It would be flexible to meet the demands of the service.
- Consultation would take place as part of the planning process.
- General support for the report.

RESOLVED

That the 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.

Re-Admission of the Public

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

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

The Commission confirmed the following reports:

27 September 2021

Community Grants Procedure & Outcomes Framework

22 November 2021

Budget Strategy 2022/23 – 2026/27

Treasury Management Mid-Year Review 2021-2022

2021/2022 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 2

31 January 2022

2022/2023 Budget and Council Tax

Treasury Management Strategy 2022-2023

2021/2022 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 3

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission concluded, the Vice Chair declared the meeting closed at 21.24pm.

**K Khan
Vice Chair**

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Cabinet

Wednesday, 8 September 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

P K Lamb (Chair)	Leader of the Council
I T Irvine	Cabinet Member for Housing
M G Jones	Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement
C J Mullins	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
P C Smith	Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development

Also in Attendance:

Councillor R D Burrett, D Crow and K Khan

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Siraj Choudhury	Head of Legal, Governance and HR
Ian Duke	Deputy Chief Executive
Karen Hayes	Head of Corporate Finance
Matt Lethbridge	Community Services Manager
Chris Pedlow	Democratic Services Manager
Karen Rham	Neighbourhood Services Manager
Nigel Sheehan	Head of Projects and Commercial Services
Kate Wilson	Head of Community Services

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor R S Fiveash and G S Jhans

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 30 June 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader, subject to a minor amendment to item 1 Declarations of Interest.

The declaration should read:

Councillor P Smith	Replacement Article 4 Directions for Main Employment Areas (Class MA) (Minute 12)	Personal Interest – As Councillor P Smith is Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business
-----------------------	--	--

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 item 13 *Property Acquisition to Increase the Council's Portfolio of Temporary Accommodation*.

5. 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.

6. Petition – 'Keep your dog on a lead in Tilgate Park'.

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing presented joint report [HCS/30](#) of the Head of Community Services and the Petitions Officer.

The report responded to the petition submitted from residents titled 'Keep your dog on a lead in Tilgate Park.' The petition documented the concerns and wished the council to increase signage and warden patrol around Tilgate lake to ensure dogs were kept on leads while walking around the lake and to implement the enforcement of rules when this was not adhered to:

"We the undersigned petition the council to Increase signage and warden patrol around Tilgate lake to ensure dogs are kept on leads while walking around the lake. To implement enforcement of rules are not adhered too. My dog was attacked while walking around the lake by a dog that was not kept on its lead. The rules are clear on the website, however there isn't sufficient signage and enforcement of rules for dog owners not adhering to the rules. Therefore increased presence of signage, policing and enforcement is required"

The principal petitioner was invited to address the Cabinet on their petition but declined the opportunity.

The report also outlined the research that had been undertaken following receipt of the petition along with the key areas for consideration.

Councillor Mullins, as Cabinet Member for Wellbeing, expressed his empathy for those that had signed the petition, as he was aware of the problem that the petition was highlighting, and he acknowledged that the Commission had held a good debate on the petition. He commented that the Commission had considered the options within the report and as shown in the Commission's comment sheet before the Cabinet, they supported option 2, but Councillor Mullins stated he was more than happy to put forward the stronger approach of option 3.

Councillor Khan read out report [OSC/296](#) the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 6 September 2021, which included:

- Acknowledged that the issue of dogs off leads attacking other dogs, people and other types of wildlife was not solely a Tilgate lake issues and such attacks had occurred across the Borough.
- That the Commission preferred option 2 as it was a stronger approach than the current method.
- They also felt that option 3, may be heavily resource intensive without resulting in behavioural change and minimum reward in comparison.

Councillor Crow was invited to speak on the item and commented he had first hand experience through a family member being attacked by an unleashed dog whilst they ran around Tilgate lake. He commented it was a difficult choice and wished Cabinet well in tackling this tricky matter.

The Cabinet held a long debate comparing the stronger approach of option 3 compared to opting for option 2, including the difference in cost against the likely outcomes, impact of the options on the Community Wardens and other Council services, how a PSPO could be used and where it should cover, the expectations of residents including the impact on dog walkers along with other factors. Arising from this discussion the Cabinet felt that they could not make an informed decision, without receiving more detailed analysis on the implication of option 3 and therefore agreed that a further report was required.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet requests that Officers bring a further report back for its consideration, which provides more detail with regards to the potential implementation of option 3 referred to within the report [HCS/30](#).

In order for Cabinet to make an informed decision, the requested report should provide information on option 3, the possible changes to service delivery and personnel, expected financial implications and any legal aspects. This will include details on the use of bye-laws and the installation of a PSPO together with the associated statutory consultation requirements.

Reasons for the Recommendations

To ensure the procedure for petitions as detailed in the Council's Constitution is adhered to.

To ensure that Cabinet are making an full informed decision on the subject on the petition - 'Keep your dog on a lead in Tilgate Park.'

7. 2021/2022 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 1

The Leader presented report [FIN/531](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance. The report set out a summary of the Council's actual revenue and capital spending for the Quarter 1 of the 2021-2022 financial year. The figures showed an expected overspend of in the revenue budget of £1.529mill, but with use of the 'use of approved coronavirus budgets' reserve of £1.008mil and Grants' relating to sales, fees and charges of £250k, the predicted revised deficit would be £271k. It was explained the majority of the deficit was directly or indirect Covid related. The HRA was showing an underspend of £5k currently but that figure did not account for the potential repairs and maintenance overspend which was being investigated.

The capital budget expenditure to end of Quarter 1 was £9.033mil and with an estimate total capital spend for the year of £54.356mil. The report also detailed proposed redistribute funds within the ICT budget and proposals with regard to the Unsupervised Play Investment Programme.

Councillor Khan presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 6 September 2021, which included that they noted that the majority of the reasons overspent for this quarter were still Covid related and that they would want to be monitoring this in the next few Quarters' report, especially regarding K2 Crawley.

Councillor Crow spoken on the report acknowledging the uncertain times that the Council was functioning in, also added his support with regards to Recommendation 5 relating to the refurbishment of playgrounds.

Councillors Irvine and C Mullins also spoke regarding to issues relating respectively their Portfolios as part of the discussion on the report.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet:

- a) notes the projected outturn for the year 2021/2022 as summarised in this report [FIN/531](#)
- b) notes the potential overspend on HRA responsive repairs as shown in paragraph 8.4 of report [FIN/531](#) .
- c) notes that the ICT budget has been increased by £100,000 for Hardware Renewals and that this will be funded from the ICT Renewals Reserve.
- d) approves the increase the capital budget by £35,000 in 2021/22 to purchase a Legal Case Management System this will be funded from New Burdens grant received from the government.
- e) approves the draw down from the existing refurbishment of playgrounds future schemes for the two play schemes as identified in paragraph 9.9 of report [FIN/531](#) which will be funded from available S106 (subject to delegated approval).

Reasons for the Recommendations

To report to Councillors on the projected outturn for the year compared to the approved budget.

8. Cabinet Appointments to Outside Bodies and Organisations

The Leader presented report [LDS/172](#) and it was noted there were additional nominations to be sought for Cabinet Outside Bodies.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet appointed the following Councillors to the Outside Bodies for 2021/2022:

Name of Organisation	2021/2022 Appointment
The Cycling Forum	Councillor Irvine
High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Advisory Committee	Councillor Irvine
Gatwick Airport Noise Management Board	Vacancy
Gatwick Airport Noise Management Board Community Forum	Vacancy
Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group	Councillor Lamb

Reason for the Recommendations

To appoint to additional outside bodies in relation to Cabinet functions for 2021/2022.

9. 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.

10. Property Acquisition to Increase the Council's Portfolio of Temporary Accommodation

***Exempt Part B - By Virtue of Paragraph 3
Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person
(including the authority holding that information)***

The Cabinet Member for Housing presented report SHAP/83. The report sought approval to purchase a property on the open market to be used for Temporary Accommodation. The purchase will be funded through the approved budget for Temporary Accommodation.

Councillor Khan presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission's comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 6 September 2021, which included their general support as it would be a flexible approach to meet the demands of the service and acknowledged that consultation would take place as part of the planning process.

During discussion on the report Members of the Cabinet expressed their support for the report's proposal to help address some of the temporary accommodation needs within the Borough.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet delegates the negotiation, approval and completion of all relevant legal documentation to complete the purchase/acquisition, to the Head of Strategic Housing Services, Head of Legal, Governance and HR and Head of Corporate Finance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Housing.

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

Reasons for the Recommendations

The Council currently has 279 households in temporary accommodation, 100 of these in nightly paid accommodation, including 30 out of borough placements. This represents the highest level of need and demand for temporary accommodation faced by the Council to date.

The average net cost of nightly paid accommodation to the council per household per week is £211.50 equating to £21,150.00 per week / £1.1m per year for current numbers. This figure does not include any additional financial burdens arising from non-payment of contributions or ineligibility for benefits.

A raft of measures is being progressed both locally and at a countywide level to reduce the pressure on nightly paid accommodation. This report is focused on one of these work strands, namely to expand the portfolio of Council owned temporary accommodation.

This detached two storey property will provide an additional 6 units of temporary accommodation.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Cabinet concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 7.50 pm

P K LAMB
Chair

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Licensing Committee

Monday, 13 September 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

K L Jaggard (Chair)

A Nawaz (Vice-Chair)

Z Ali, M L Ayling, S Buck, B J Burgess, R S Fiveash, M G Jones, K McCarthy, C J Mullins,
D M Peck and M W Pickett

Officers Present:

Kareen Plympton	Health, Safety and Licensing Team Leader
Jess Tamplin	Democratic Services Support Officer
Astrid Williams	Senior Lawyer (Solicitor)
Kate Wilson	Head of Community Services

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor J Bounds

Absent:

Councillor M Morris

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 2 March 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. Public Question Time

There were no questions submitted by members of the public.

4. Review of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy

The Committee considered report [HCS/31](#) of the Head of Community Services. The Health, Safety and Licensing Team Leader presented the report in full, which set out a range of proposed changes to the Council's Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy. The revised policy sought to incorporate recommendations made by the Department for Transport (DfT) in its July 2020 document 'Statutory Taxi & Private Hire Vehicle Standards'. The DfT recommendations aimed to standardise licensed vehicle policies across all licensing authorities in order to improve national standards of good practice and facilitate public safety. It was heard that the Council's existing policy already incorporated many of the DfT standards, but various changes had been made to improve the policy.

Committee members discussed the report and policy in detail. Matters raised included:

- The importance of licensed drivers being 'fit and proper'. It was confirmed that this was determined by a number of factors including but not limited to: criminal records checks, medical checks, driving tests, the Knowledge Test, and Disability Awareness training. The Committee heard that public safety was ultimately the basis of the 'fit and proper' test. Thorough investigative processes would be actioned, on a case-by-case basis, if public safety concerns were raised regarding a driver.
- Alcohol consumption by licensed drivers. A suggestion was made that the proposed policy wording, which recommended licensed drivers not consume alcohol during or 'immediately before' driving a licensed vehicle, be tightened to ensure no alcohol was drunk at any time prior to driving. The Licensing Team Leader confirmed that drivers were strongly advised not to consume alcohol prior to driving, and that the policy reflected legislation.
- Publicity of the consultation. Committee members requested that the consultation be widely publicised; to which the Licensing Team Leader confirmed that it was to be made available on the Crawley Borough Council website and publicised via the Council's social media channels. Details of the consultation were also due to be communicated to private hire vehicle operators and members of the taxi trade, as well as to key members of the community who would seek to encourage responses to the consultation.
- Implementation of the DfT standards. The Licensing Team Leader clarified that a 'compelling local reason' must be provided for not implementing the standards, e.g. more research being required or financial viability for licensed drivers. There were hesitations regarding some of the measures within the standards such as installation of CCTV cameras in vehicles.
- Licensed drivers' English language proficiency. It was heard that the DfT standards introduced a requirement that English language skills be assessed – the policy did not make provision for a specific test but rather requested drivers provide proof of qualifications or information to demonstrate their language proficiency.
- The previously-taken decision regarding permanent signage on licensed vehicle doors. Door signs were only able to be covered when stationary on the proprietor's private property. It was confirmed that the DfT standards did not recommend any changes to the position on removable signage.
- Working hours and tiredness while driving. Following a suggestion that tachographs be installed in licensed vehicles, the Licensing Team Leader clarified that these were not required by legislation nor the DfT standards. Drivers should work a responsible number of hours (with appropriate rest breaks) and operators should ensure drivers are not working excessively.

- Disability awareness. The Committee discussed the need for the taxi trade to be aware of passengers' varying needs. The Licensing Team Leader explained that there was no written requirement for passengers to take the vehicle at the front of a queue if it did not meet their needs; passengers were advised to select the first licensed vehicle that did so.
- Safeguarding training. The cost of the training recommended by the DfT standards was under negotiation with training providers. The Committee was assured that competitively-priced providers were being considered.
- The Penalty Points Scheme. The Committee sought clarity on the meaning of the 'earliest reasonable opportunity' for reporting vehicle accidents. The Licensing Team Leader confirmed that drivers should aim to report as soon as possible, but it was understood that there may be circumstances under which a delay was unavoidable (e.g. due to hospitalisation from an accident). A form was available on the Council's website to allow drivers to report accidents more easily, quickly, and out-of-hours. It was confirmed that the DfT standards required convictions to be reported within 48 hours.
- Private hire vehicle arrangements at London Gatwick airport. The Committee noted that the airport was a private company which had selected one operator to provide a licensed vehicle service within its boundary.
- Minor changes to the policy wording. Committee members suggested that some clauses in the policy be worded more objectively.

Concerns were raised regarding the proposed period of 24 months after qualifying within which licensed drivers were required to complete safeguarding training. It was moved that the policy be amended to require safeguarding training to instead be completed within 12 months. A vote was taken and it was **AGREED** that the amendment be incorporated in to the draft policy and therefore form part of the substantive recommendation.

The Committee noted that the final draft of the revised policy was subject to minor typographical and clerical changes before publication for consultation.

The Committee requested that its thanks be communicated to the officers responsible for report HCS/31 and the associated work that was undertaken.

RESOLVED

- 1) That the Committee considers the report and decide what amendments, if any, it wishes to make to the proposed revised draft of the policy
- 2) That the Committee agrees a final consultation draft of the revised policy.
- 3) That the Committee authorises the Head of Community Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability, to undertake a consultation exercise for a minimum of 4 weeks.
- 4) That the Committee notes that a further report will be prepared for consideration at the Licensing Committee post-consultation which will detail the responses to this consultation with a view to the Committee then considering what changes, if any, to make to the policy in light of the consultation responses.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Licensing Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.18 pm

**K L Jaggard
(Chair)**

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Governance Committee

Tuesday, 21 September 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

K McCarthy (Chair)

T Lunnon (Vice-Chair)

R D Burrett, D Crow, C R Eade, M Flack, P K Lamb, R A Lanzer and S Malik

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl

Chief Executive

Siraj Choudhury

Head of Legal, Governance and HR

Mez Matthews

Democratic Services Officer

Andrew Oakley

Electoral Services Manager

Apology for Absence:

Councillor G S Jhans

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Minutes

In connection with Minute 4 (Annual Governance Statement) a Committee Member drew attention to the note by the Head of Legal, Governance and HR which advised that the deadline for signing the Statement of Accounts had been moved from 31 July 2021 to 30 September 2021 and that an Audit Committee meeting had been scheduled for 30 September 2021 to ensure the Accounts were signed off within the required timeframe. The 30 September 2021 Audit Committee had recently been cancelled and the Committee Member queried whether the deadline for signing off the Statement of Accounts had been further extended. In response to the query the Committee was advised that the 30 September 2021 Audit Committee had been cancelled at the request of the Head of Corporate Finance and that the Statement of Accounts would now be considered at the 14 December 2021 Audit Committee. The Committee was advised that a fuller explanation would be sought from the Head of Corporate Finance and circulated via email to the Governance Committee.

NOTE BY THE HEAD OF LEGAL, GOVERNANCE AND HR: The deadline for signing the Statement of Accounts for 2020/21 was extended to 30 September 2021 however, The Accounts and Audit Regulations (2015) state that where an audit has not been concluded within the specified timeframe, the Council must approve the Statement of Accounts as soon as reasonably practicable after the receipt of the audit report. The

Statement of Accounts will therefore be considered at the 14 December 2021 Audit Committee.

The minutes of the meeting of the Governance Committee held on 22 June 2021 were then approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. Public Question Time

No questions were asked by the public.

4. Review of May 2021 Polling Arrangements

The Committee considered report [LDS/171](#) of the Head of Legal, Governance and HR which requested that the Committee consider the outcome of the temporary changes to the Scheme of Polling Places made for the elections held on 6 May 2021 and decide whether to make any changes to the existing Scheme (adopted in 2019) either on a permanent or temporary (one year) basis. In making its decision the Committee were requested to consider whether to extend the temporary replacement of schools for a further year.

The Electoral Services Manager presented the report and drew the Committee's attention to the Supplementary Agenda which provided amended 2021 electorate figures for some Polling Districts.

To assist in the Committee's consideration, the Chair advised that they intended to move recommendation d) of paragraph 5.1 of the report as it gave the Committee the opportunity to vote on all possible permutations. In light of this, debate and voting on each Polling District took place in turn. The Polling Districts, as well as the normal Polling Place and the Polling Place used for the May 2021 elections, were set out in Paragraph 4.4 of the report.

General Comments:

It was acknowledged that a public poll had indicated that the public experience of the May 2021 election had been good and the Committee thanked the Elections staff for the work they had undertaken.

Following a query from a Committee Member, it was acknowledged that any suggestion to merge Polling Districts would need to be brought before a future Committee meeting to ensure the Committee had sufficient information and time to consider such a proposal.

It was suggested that having several Polling Places within an Electoral Ward reduced the number of people queuing to vote. It was also stated that keeping some consistency in Polling Places encouraged voter turnout.

Several Committee Members expressed the view that the temporary replacement of all schools identified in Paragraph 4.4 of the report should be extended for another year to avoid any further disruption in children's education.

Polling District LAB (Bewbush & North Broadfield Ward):

It was suggested that Broadfield Community Centre had worked well as a combined Polling Place for Polling Districts LAB, LBB and LEB during the May 2021 election. However, the view was also expressed that, given the large combined electorate of those three Polling Districts, having a single Polling Place for all three Polling Districts could cause capacity issues, especially during a general election.

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LAB should be Broadfield Community Centre on a permanent basis.

Polling District LBB (Broadfield Ward):

It was acknowledged that the comments made with regard to Polling District LAB above were also relevant for Polling District LBB.

Following a query from the Committee, the Electoral Services Manager confirmed that although Community Services had advised that Creasys Drive Adventure Playground might be available to use as a Polling Place for the May 2022 election, its availability could not be guaranteed.

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LBB should be Broadfield Community Centre on a permanent basis.

Polling District LEB (Gossops Green & North East Broadfield Ward):

It was acknowledged that the comments made with regard to Polling District LAB above were also relevant for Polling District LEB.

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LEB should be Broadfield Community Centre on a permanent basis.

Polling District LJA (Pound Hill North & Forge Wood Ward):

It was stressed that the Committee had originally agreed that Milton Mount Community Centre be used as a Polling Place on a temporary basis. Several Committee Members stated that, as Milton Mount Community Centre was situated at the top of a hill, it was less accessible to the elderly and it was noted that notices close to the Community Centre discouraged parking in the area. It was suggested that the Polling Place should revert back to The Grattons Indoors Bowls Club as its location was more central and it had better parking provisions.

The Committee was advised that elector turnout had increased by 5.8% for the May 2021 election across all methods of voting when Milton Mount Community Centre was the Polling Place. Following a related query from a Committee Member it was noted that the 5.8% increase was a 3% increase in in-person voting and an 11% increase in postal voting. It was suggested that those figures implied that the location of Milton Mount Community Centre had not deterred voters from voting in-person.

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LJA should revert back to The Grattons Indoors Bowls Club.

Polling District LFB (Ifield Ward):

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LFB should be Ifield Community Centre on a one year temporary basis.

Polling District LFD (Ifield Ward):

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LFD should be Ifield West Community Centre on a one year temporary basis.

Polling District LHB (Maidenbower Ward):

The opinion was expressed that whilst using Maidenbower Community Centre for both Polling Districts LHA and LHB could cause long queues during peak times, it was likely that those queues would be manageable for local Borough elections, but could cause long queues for General elections.

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LHB should be Maidenbower Community Centre on a one year temporary basis.

Polling District LJC (Pound Hill North & Forge Wood Ward):

The Committee was reminded that the use of Forge Wood Primary School as a Polling Place had originally been agreed as a temporary measure whilst Forge Wood Community Centre (which would become the permanent Polling Place) was under construction. Disappointment was expressed by the Committee that the timescale set out for completing the Community Centre development had not been met.

Following a vote by the Committee it was declared that the Polling Place for Polling District LJC should be Wakehams Green Community Centre on a one year temporary basis.

With the voting concluded on the Polling Place for each individual Polling District the Committee agreed that the Full Council be recommended to amend the 2019 Polling Scheme to incorporate the changes agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the Full Council be recommended to amend the 2019 Polling Scheme as set out in the Appendix to these minutes.

5. LGA Model Councillor Code of Conduct

The Committee considered report [LDS/164](#) of the Monitoring Officer (Head of Legal, Governance and HR) which requested that the Committee consider whether to adopt the Local Government Association's (LGA) Model Councillor Code of Conduct ("Model Code") in full or in part, or whether to retain the Council's current Code of Conduct for Councillors ("Code of Conduct").

In presenting the report the Head of Legal, Governance and HR stressed that there was currently no legislation to accompany the Model Code. The Committee was advised that a survey conducted among Monitoring Officers in Local Government showed that 55% of Councils had chosen not to adopt the Model Code (25% not adopting the Model Code at all and 30% not adopting the Model Code but changing their existing Code), 20% of Councils had adopted the Model Code in full, 20% had adopted the Model Code in part, and 5% of Councils remained undecided.

In addition the Head of Legal, Governance and HR advised that the Model Code had not brought “teeth” to the Code which many Councils had hoped for. The Committee’s attention was specifically drawn to Paragraph 6.4 of the report which drew comparisons between the Model Code and the Council’s current Code of Conduct, and Paragraph 7 which set out the proposed timetable. The Head of Legal, Governance and HR advised that, in addition to reviewing the Council’s current Code of Conduct, a review of the Council’s Procedure for Dealing with Code Complaints would be necessary. It was anticipated that any change to the Council’s Code of Conduct and related Procedures would come into effect in the new municipal year.

The Committee then considered both the report and the Model Code, and made the following comments:

- The comparisons drawn in Paragraph 6.4 of the report were helpful.
- The Model Code ultimately appeared to change very little.
- Expressed disappointment that the Model Code lacked sanctions, although it was noted that Political Parties had the option to impose sanctions on members of its own party.
- If a Model Code was produced in future which fulfilled the needs and wishes of the Council it could be useful to adopt such a document as it would be consistent across the majority of Councils.
- The first person narrative of the Model Code was not favoured.
- In reviewing the Council’s current Code of Conduct and Procedure, it would be beneficial to seek the Council’s Independent Persons’ views on the current documents and procedures.
- Support expressed of reviewing the Council’s current Code of Conduct.

RESOLVED

1. That the new LGA Model Councillor Code of Conduct not be adopted.
2. That the Council’s current Code of Conduct and Procedure for Dealing with Code Complaints be reviewed by the Head of Legal, Governance and HR, and that a revised Code be presented to the Governance Committee on 25 January 2022. This may incorporate specific elements of the LGA Model Code.
3. That the timetable set out in Section 7 of report LDS/164 be approved.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Governance Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.07 pm

**K McCarthy
(Chair)**

Appendix: Polling Scheme 2021/22 with Temporary Amendments

Polling District	Borough Ward	County Division	Polling Station	Electorate (Sept 2021)	Postal Voters	Polling Station Voters
LAA	Bewbush and North Broadfield	Bewbush and Ifield West	Bewbush Centre	6206	1077	5129
LAB	Bewbush and North Broadfield	Broadfield	Broadfield Community Centre	970	232	738
LAC	Bewbush and North Broadfield	Southgate and Gossops Green	Bewbush Centre	42	8	34
LBA	Broadfield	Broadfield	Broadfield Community Centre	4645	884	3761
LBB	Broadfield	Broadfield	Broadfield Community Centre	2651	696	1955
LD	Furnace Green	Tilgate and Furnace Green	Furnace Green Community Centre	4481	1072	3409
LEA	Gossops Green and North-East Broadfield	Southgate and Gossops Green	Gossops Green Community Centre	3929	890	3039
LEB	Gossops Green and North-East Broadfield	Broadfield	Broadfield Community Centre	828	299	529
LFA	Ifield	Langley Green and Ifield East	Ifield Community Centre	3579	819	2760
LFB	Ifield	Langley Green and Ifield East	Ifield Community Centre *	782	249	533
LFC	Ifield	Bewbush and Ifield West	Ifield West Community Centre	2242	402	1840
LFD	Ifield	Bewbush and Ifield West	Ifield West Community Centre *	590	188	402
LGA	Langley Green and Tushmore	Langley Green and Ifield East	Langley Green Centre	5562	1014	4548
LGB	Langley Green and Tushmore	Northgate and West Green	Northgate Community Centre	485	115	370
LHA	Maidenbower	Maidenbower and Worth	Maidenbower Community Centre	2849	628	2221
LHB	Maidenbower	Maidenbower and Worth	The Brook School	3903	1106	2797
LIA	Northgate and West Green	Northgate and West Green	Northgate Community Centre	3479	645	2834
LIB	Northgate and West Green	Northgate and West Green	The Charis Centre	4127	875	3252
LJA	Pound Hill North and Forge Wood	Pound Hill	The Grattons Indoors Bowls Club	2872	649	2223
LJB	Pound Hill North and Forge Wood	Pound Hill	Wakehams Green Community Centre	1677	277	1400
LJC	Pound Hill North and Forge Wood	Pound Hill	Wakehams Green Community Centre *	2076	497	1579
LKA	Pound Hill South and Worth	Three Bridges	Pound Hill Community Centre	2767	577	2190

Polling District	Borough Ward	County Division	Polling Station	Electorate (Sept 2021)	Postal Voters	Polling Station Voters
LKB	Pound Hill South and Worth	Pound Hill	St Edward the Confessor Church Hall	1138	270	868
LKC	Pound Hill South and Worth	Maidenbower and Worth	St Edward the Confessor Church Hall	2310	643	1667
LLA	Southgate	Southgate and Gossops Green	St Mary's Church Hall	2991	731	2260
LLB	Southgate	Southgate and Gossops Green	Southgate West Community Centre	2901	832	2069
LLC	Southgate	Northgate and West Green	Southgate West Community Centre	632	194	438
LMA	Three Bridges	Three Bridges	Montefiore Institute	2787	656	2131
LMB	Three Bridges	Three Bridges	Three Bridges Community Centre	1849	489	1360
LMC	Three Bridges	Three Bridges	Holiday Inn Express	1273	246	1027
LMD	Three Bridges	Northgate and West Green	The Town Hall	391	78	313
LNA	Tilgate	Tilgate and Furnace Green	Tilgate Community Centre	2376	495	1881
LNB	Tilgate	Tilgate and Furnace Green	Holy Trinity Church Hall	2083	394	1689
				81473	18227	63246

* = temporary polling place to remain in force up to and including elections to be held on 5th May 2022

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Commission

Monday, 27 September 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

T G Belben (Chair)

K Khan (Vice-Chair)

M L Ayling, R G Burgess, R A Lanzer, S Mullins, A Nawaz, A Pendlington and S Piggott

Also in Attendance:

Councillor B J Burgess, R D Burrett and M G Jones

Officers Present:

Ian Duke	Deputy Chief Executive
Heather Girling	Democratic Services Officer
Matt Lethbridge	Community Services Manager
Mez Matthews	Democratic Services Officer
Kate Wilson	Head of Community Services

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor B A Smith

1. Disclosures of Interest and Whipping Declarations

The following disclosures were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor R A Lanzer	Community Grants Procedure & Outcomes Framework (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	HASC (Minute 6)	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor R A Lanzer	HASC (Minute 6)	Personal Interest – WSCC Cabinet Member for Public Health and Wellbeing

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 6 September 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. Public Question Time

No questions from the public were asked.

4. Community Grants Procedure & Outcomes Framework

The Commission considered report [HCS/29](#) of the Head of Community Services. The report sought approval for the future process and outcomes framework relating to the community grants programme.

During the discussion with the Cabinet Member for Public Protection & Community Engagement, Head of Community Services and Community Services Manager, Councillors made the following comments:

- Confirmation was provided on the proposed new grants procedure and outcomes framework as set out in report [HCS/29](#). The grants process was recognised as being important for organisations as pandemic restrictions eased.
- Verification was provided on the application process and the criteria being applied, focusing on equally rated key priority areas.
- Confirmation that the priorities and outcomes for the new grants programme would be able to be revised periodically as required as there may be a need to adapt to changes in funding and ways of working.
- It was recognised that the application process had been streamlined with a 'simplified' version for the small grants application. Ultimately, the application process for strategic grants would require a greater level of detail than those applying to the small grants but both processes would be predominantly online. Groups would make regular contact prior to submitting applications with officers from Community Development offering support, which would continue throughout the funding process.
- Acknowledgement that the officers' commitment, negotiation and support had been a continuing factor in the success the programme over its many years, building the engagement with the voluntary sector and outside organisations.
- Explanations were sought and obtained on the details regarding the funding pots and budget provision.
- Monitoring reports would continue to be a requirement (quarterly, annually and end of project) so as to ensure the grant was spent as intended, together with action in place if it was spent fraudulently.
- Confirmation was provided on the revised Countywide 'Community Advice and Support Service' (CASS) which would remain as a jointly commissioned service. This would provide for an information and advice service such as currently provided by Citizens Advice West Sussex to be delivered in Crawley. WSCC would lead the countywide procurement process.
- Confirmation was provided on the crowdfunding agreement, particularly as it was commented that crowdfunding may generate significant interest. Currently there was an expectation for an organisation to reach a threshold before funding was released and if that was not reached the organisation would be directed to the small grants scheme. It was recognised that other alternative (external) funding

opportunities may be available for organisations. However, the council would still be looking to assist in signposting.

- Recognition that generally the feedback from the voluntary sector had been one of understanding with regards to the council's position. It was acknowledged there were many groups and organisations within the town and it would be useful for councillors to be aware of which groups were in receipt of funding within their wards.
- There was a need to ascertain the impact on various groups and also promote the grants scheme particularly through the community, through different media, other funding bodies and networking opportunities.

RESOLVED

That the 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. Cabinet Member Discussion with the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement

The Commission noted the update given by Councillor Jones and questioned him on a variety of issues relating to his [portfolio](#).

The following topics were discussed:

- Having recently returned to the position of Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement it was welcoming to be back to celebrate the community spirit in Crawley.
- The portfolio covered a variety of services including most recently the unveiling of a war memorial at St Johns Church to the most recent Crawley Pride event in Goffs Park which was an extremely successful event.
- As part of Fostering Interest in Local Government it was queried if any events would be taking place as part of Local Democracy Week (11-17 October). It was confirmed that further discussions were currently underway.
- Acknowledgement that the OSC would receive its annual update on the Safer Crawley Partnership at its November meeting. Meetings with the Civil Military Partnership had recommenced following the easing of restrictions.
- Details were provided on the structure of the Nuisance and Anti-Social Behaviour Team and services provided in relation to ASB.
- It was noted it would be beneficial to have a representation on the amount of cybercrime occurring within the town, particularly for the Safer Crawley Partnership update.

RESOLVED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Commission thanked Councillor Jones for attending and for the informative discussion that had ensued.

6. Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee (HASC)

An update was provided from the most recent HASC meeting. Key items of discussion included:

A new system had been set up to monitor performance in the various sectors of WSCC's remit. Key areas of scrutiny for each portfolio included

- Will the new format enable effective scrutiny?
- Effective use of measures in place.
- Measures which are most critical to the committee's focus.
- Management of corporate risk.
- Identifying specific areas for action or response within the portfolio.
- Issues requiring further scrutiny.

The report focussed on highlighting situations within the different portfolios that impacted on delivering the 4 Council priorities.

- Keeping people safe from vulnerable situations
- A sustainable and prosperous economy.
- Helping people and communities fulfil their potential.
- Making best use of resources.

The issue of tackling climate change underpinned all the work. The reports were the first under the new system. There were pressures on both the Adult Services Portfolio and the Public Health and Wellbeing Portfolio and in the coming months the key performance indicators would be considered to see how areas of influence within portfolios were performing and the reports would be published quarterly.

The substantive item from the agenda concerned a report from the Sussex Health and Care Partnership on Covid 19 recovery and restoration of health services for West Sussex residents. Major points included:

- Matters were challenging because of Covid 19 and continued to be so.
- There was evidence of good collaborative working – within the top 10 decil nationally.
- There had been greater elective response including liaison with private providers.
- Integrated services were being developed.
- There was no mention in the report of the role of patient groups in helping to drive services forward.

Operational Response to Covid 19

- 12-15 were being worked on.
- There was a need to separate dosage figures for care homes between residents and staff.

Restoration of Services

- There had been some problems with communicating the position regarding the restoration of services to people.
- Flu vaccine rates had improved on previous years.
- Access to GPs was still a problem – the situation had improved but there was still a lot to do. However, West Sussex was among the best countrywide.
- The default position should not be the emergency services.
- It was important that face to face GP referral improves.

Urgent Emergency Care

- Emergency care had remained open throughout the pandemic but great pressures remain particularly on Walk In Centres and Urgent Treatment Centres

Hospital Elective Treatment

- There was no mention of the Ambulance Service in the report.
- It was important that working with patient groups continued.
- There was a need to keep an eye on acute services.
- Any staff shortages needed to be addressed.

Cancer

- Referrals had increased
- Work was on-going concerning cancer prevention, diagnosis and treatment.

Mental Health

- Need for greater mental health support in schools.
- Expert advice was now going in.

Transformation of Mental Health Services

- Community mental health services were at the heart of the NHS long term plan – developing new and integrated models of primary and community health care.

Primary Care (GP Practices)

- Very high levels of demand
- GP practices never closed but worked in a different way.
- All forms of appointment (face to face, telephone, online) were available.
- There has been a slow but steady increase in face to face referrals.

Winter Planning

- The plan was a dynamic document.
- Winter 2021-2022 likely to be very challenging.
- Work was taking place to build in lessons learned from winter 2020-2021.
- Resilience of GP care was paramount.
- The position of 12-15 year olds was being planned for.
- Booster jabs (third jabs) were coming soon.

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

The Commission confirmed the following reports:

OSC 22 November

Budget Strategy 2022/23 – 2026/27
Treasury Management Mid-Year Review 2021-2022
2021/2022 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 2
Crawley Economic Recovery Plan
Town Centre Regeneration Programme v3
Crawley Fusion Innovation Centre Scheme Business Case (Part B)

OSC 31 January

2022/2023 Budget and Council Tax
Treasury Management Strategy 2022-2023
2021/2022 Budget Monitoring - Quarter 3

The Chair requested a report to OSC on the major works currently being undertaken at Milton Mount flats, particularly in relation to the water pressure. The report should detail considerations, alternative options and resolutions.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 8.58 pm.

**T G Belben
(Chair)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Cabinet

Wednesday, 29 September 2021 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
M G Jones	Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement
C J Mullins	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
P C Smith	Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development

Also in Attendance:

Councillor D Crow, R D Burrett and T G Belben

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Chris Pedlow	Democracy & Data Manager
Matt Lethbridge	Community Services Manager
Nigel Sheehan	Head of Projects and Commercial Services
Kate Wilson	Head of Community Services

Apologies for Absence:

Absent

Councillor R S Fiveash

1. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures of interests were made.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 8 September 2021 were approved as a correct record.

3. Public Question Time

There were no questions from the public.

4. **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.

5. **Community Grants Procedure & Outcomes Framework**

The Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement introduced report [HCS/29](#) of the Head of Community Services. The report sought approval for updated community grants procedure and outcomes framework, which built on the decision that Cabinet took last year, including some alterations to strengthen the process going forward. The changes included adding a further fourth priority – Community Spirit and altering the small grants scheme to enable a booster pot that would enable a more adaptable approach and adding a new aim for the small grants scheme of “*Foster greater levels of community connectivity and cohesion*”.

Councillor T Belben presented the Overview and Scrutiny Commission’s comments on the report to the Cabinet following consideration of the matter at its meeting on 27 September 2021, which included the Commission having sought clarity on the support that would be provided to third sector organisations and community groups with the new online application process. Questions were also raised during the Commission’s discussion on the report over the crowdfunding threshold and how the monitoring of the success of the new process would occur.

Councillor Crow was invited to speak to the item. He welcomed the report and the new priorities and hoped that there would be a light touch review after a year to ensure that the scheme was proving to be effective in its support.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet

- a) approves the Community Grants Procedure and Outcomes Framework including the associated proposal, process, priorities and outcomes and decision making delegations as set out in sections 5.1 to 5.20 of report [HCS/29](#)
- b) approves a ring fenced sum of £140,569 for the new Community Advice and Support Service (CASS) contract from the strategic grants & commissioning allocation as set out in section 5.6 of report [HCS/29](#)
- c) delegates authority to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement in consultation with the Head of Community Services, and Head of Legal, Governance and HR to enter into an Inter-Agency Agreement to support continued partnership working, and approve the award of the CASS contract following an appropriate procurement process.
- d) delegates the negotiation, approval and completion of all relevant legal documentation, following the awarding of the contract to the Head of Community Services, Head of Legal, Governance and HR, Head of Corporate Finance, in

consultation with the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement.

Reasons for the Recommendations

The recommendation supports the Council to achieve a balanced budget position for 2022/23 onwards.

It responds to the approach agreed at Cabinet on 3 February 2021, to develop a strategic/commissioned and small grants funding programme with a focus on high quality outcomes that, with the new priorities, better responds to particular needs of our community.

6. Leisure Contract - Extension of Variation Order

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing presented report [HPS/28](#) of the Head of Major Projects and Commercial Services. The report set out the arrangements the Council had entered into with Everyone Active (EA) following the initial lockdown in March 2020 and recommended that the Cabinet extends the variation order to facilitate the continued opening of the leisure centres over the period 1 October 2021 – 31 March 2022. It was noted pleasingly that the number of users using the facilities at K2 Crawley were slowly but surely increasing and it was hoped that this pattern would continue.

Councillor Crow was invited to speak on the item and commented that he acknowledged that there were no real alternatives for the Cabinet to consider, but to continue in the proposed approach of the contract variation, however the increasing users was a positive.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet approves the extension of the contract variation with Everyone Active under the terms set out in section 5.7 of report [HPS/28](#).

Reasons for the Recommendations

The recommendation facilitates the continued re-opening of the leisure centres providing the opportunity to grow customer base and membership numbers while adhering to the Government's Procurement Policy Note 02/20 (Supplier Relief Due to Coronavirus).

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Cabinet concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 7.12 pm

P K LAMB
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8

Crawley Borough Council

Report to Council

20th October 2021

Crawley City Status Bid

Report of the Chief Executive
CEX/56

1. Purpose

- 1.1 Members will be aware that the Queen is celebrating 70 years on the throne in 2022 which will be her platinum jubilee. To mark this unique occasion the UK Government has launched a number of rare civic competitions including, 'City Status' and 'Lord Mayor or Lord Provost status', for a number of worthy towns and cities located in the United Kingdom, a Crown Dependency or Overseas Territory. In 2022 Crawley will also be celebrating its 75th anniversary as a New Town.
- 1.2 The purpose of the report is to seek agreement to the preparation and submission of a bid for City Status, for Crawley Borough, as part of the Platinum Jubilee Civic Honours Competition.

2. Recommendations

Councillors are asked to consider the content of this report and:

- a) Agree to the preparation and submission of a City Status bid for Crawley Borough as part of the Platinum Jubilee Civic Honours Competition.
- b) That, subject to a), the council commences a community stakeholder consultation exercise, that will run from 21 October 2021 to 18 November 2021.
- c) Delegate the submission of the bid to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader.

3. Reasons for the Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that an application for City Status is made in recognition of Crawley's rich heritage, from Anglo Saxon to modern day. Today Crawley is a success story and has grown to be one of the most vibrant and diverse towns in the UK, encapsulating all that is good about post-war Britain. Nearly 75 years ago a New Town was created, we envisage our bid being based around the following message *'75 years ago, you made Crawley a New Town. In that time, we have grown to become a regional powerhouse. Imagine what we can achieve if you made us a New City'*.
- 3.2 Given the significant economic impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on our town which is well documented and evidenced; securing City Status will bring with it prestige, standing and an opportunity to lever investment to aid our recovery.

Agenda Item 8

4 Background

- 4.1 Her Majesty The Queen will be the first British monarch to have reached 70 years on the throne. The Platinum Jubilee celebrations will reflect on Her Majesty's reign, and her impact on the UK and the world since 1952. As part of these celebrations, there will be a civic honours competition. This includes competitions for City Status. Any local authority in any part of the United Kingdom, a Crown Dependency or an Overseas Territory which considers that its area deserves to be granted the rare honour of City Status is welcome to enter the competition.
- 4.2 Many towns will be submitting bids for City Status and there will be significant competition from towns that have previously submitted multiple bids during the Millennium (2000), Golden Jubilee (2002) and/or Diamond Jubilee (2012) bidding rounds. Whilst we recognise that this is a hugely competitive process, we consider that given the significant impacts of the pandemic on our town, that the process and journey that we embark on in developing our bid submission with our residents, businesses and communities will help rebuild our optimism, ambition and pride. Members will be aware that in nearly every national media interview and coverage about impacts of the pandemic on jobs and the local economy, it was often Crawley that was fronting this impact. We see the bid as an opportunity to celebrate and be proud of our resilience, our people, our businesses and develop the town's potential further.
- 4.3 The bidding guidance seeks a concise overview of the place's distinct identity; civic pride; cultural infrastructure, interesting heritage, history and traditions; vibrant and welcoming community; record of innovation; sound governance and administration; associations with Royalty; and other particularly distinctive features, age, residents or communities who have made widely recognised significant contributions to society and cultural infrastructure. Alongside this it seeks to understand the place through a profile of the resident population of the area, economic activity, public green spaces, sport and leisure facilities and shopping areas, and local authority support for the voluntary sector.
- 4.4 If the recommendation to submit a bid is supported, over the next few weeks, the Council intends to mobilise residents, community groups, business representatives and voluntary organisations to be positively part of the bid process and support a compelling bid for Crawley. This is considered as a key aspect of the bid preparation.
- 4.5 The deadline for submission is 8th December 2021 at 4pm with results to be announced in 2022. The guidance does not state how many places City Status may be awarded to as part of the competition.

5 Why Crawley and what would City Status do for Crawley?

- 5.1 These are important questions to ask ourselves in our bid submission. The reasons are numerous and this will be developed as the bid is written and informed by the community consultation exercise. Some suggested responses include:
- The Queen's Platinum Jubilee also marks the 75th anniversary of the establishment as Crawley as a New Town
 - Crawley was one of the first New Towns to be designated in 1947 following the Second World War. The town has developed during the entire reign of Her Majesty. Crawley was first visited by Princess Elizabeth in 1950, when she was heir to the throne when she officially opened the Manor Royal Industrial Area
 - The importance of Crawley as a recognised and growing vibrant regional, national and international centre for economic, social and cultural activity
 - A successful bid will provide a real opportunity to demonstrate locally, regionally and nationally the ambition that Crawley has to properly fulfil its role as the major urban

Agenda Item 8

centre between the south coast and the capital and in doing so provide significant benefits to local residents

- All the communities which make up Crawley, both historical and more recent, are unique and encapsulate the principles shown by Her Majesty over her reign, such as stability, continuity and civic pride while also embracing change and innovation
- The strong and important role community, faith, voluntary and cultural organisations play in the civic life of Crawley
- That Crawley has an innovative and inventive economy with thousands of small businesses and several companies of national and international renown
- A place of festivals – Crawley Festival, Crawley Pride, Crawley Irish Festival, WORDfest – Festival of words, STEMfest
- The diversity of Crawley, including many people from the Commonwealth of Nations
- The City Status contest provides the opportunity to showcase the civic pride of Crawley, our record of innovation, our thriving, diverse and multi-faith communities and our exciting heritage and history, particularly as the most successful Mark 1 post-war New Town
- Crawley is a key transport hub, home to London Gatwick Airport and for millions their first point of arrival in the UK. It has excellent road, rail, active travel links
- It is an important tourist hub with over 45 million visitors entering the town annually (pre-pandemic). Pre-pandemic our daily population would increase to approx. 300,000 a day
- Crawley is a flourishing hub for sports and growing sporting talent. K2 Crawley remains one of the leading UK leisure centres
- Football League club Crawley Town
- Award-winning parks and gardens
- World Marble Championships
- Many notable people are/have been from Crawley – Gareth Southgate, The Cure, Dame Caroline Haslett, Alan Minter (boxer), Daley Thompson, Dan Walker, Romesh Ranganathan.

5.2 Studies suggest that a successful bid for City Status could bring further investment and employment opportunities. Newly created cities tend to outperform other areas in terms of economic performance through increased investment, increasing population and additional employment opportunities. Others have seen significant economic impact. Since securing City Status Wolverhampton has benefited from £2bn of inward investment, Newport has secured 2,000 new jobs, Sunderland has seen Nike, Nissan and Barclays locate there and Brighton and Hove's tourism spend has increased from around £400m to £700m. Clearly, the country is currently experiencing a different economic climate, and there can be no guarantees that Crawley would receive benefits of this order, but without doubt there would be economic benefits to be gained. The Council believes it would represent a major boost to Crawley's economy and a significant platform for making Crawley an even more attractive destination for businesses and jobs. With 16,000 jobs that have been lost at Gatwick Airport alone during the pandemic, the honorary 'City' title will provide a further stimulus to Crawley's recovery.

5.3 Research has also found that civic pride can be boosted with City Status with additional cultural and creative opportunities. A bid for City Status would certainly raise Crawley's profile, enhancing its reputation and ensuring it is a place that is recognised, helping to put Crawley on the map.

5.4 The definition of a city in the UK is a place which has been granted City Status by the monarch. It is important to recognise that size is not an issue to be declared a city with the smallest city in the UK being St David's in Wales having a population of only 1,600. In the 2012 Diamond Jubilee competition, St. Asaph in Wales was declared a city with a population of 3,355.

Agenda Item 8

- 5.5 City Status would be a fitting accolade to crown Crawley as part of its 75th anniversary. There is very little downside to making a bid, and much potentially to be gained. The bid will provide a foundation to start a wider discussion about the town, and its ambitions for the future. Crawley is now a town that has doubled its population to that originally intended (60,000), and today we have grown the town to the extent of its administrative boundary.

6 Information & Analysis Supporting Recommendation

- 6.1 Opportunities for securing City Status recognition are rare. Members could decide not to pursue the preparation and submission of a bid. This would prevent Crawley Borough Council from applying as applications must be made by the relevant Local Authority.

7 Implications

- 7.1 Financial Implications – The Government does not want local authorities to incur any undue expense entering the competition. It is the quality of the contents of the application, taken as a whole, that will be assessed, rather than the standard of presentation. Every effort will be made to minimise financial costs of the bid development through making use of existing events and pieces of work as well as engagement with residents, businesses and stakeholders. City Status does not carry a direct financial reward. However, it is recognised as a tool for leveraging investment.
- 7.2 Legal Implications – The decision on the award of City Status is entirely at the discretion of Her Majesty The Queen, and there are no formulaic criteria. Therefore, there are no strict legal criteria to meet, just the preparation of a robust bid that fulfils the criteria as detailed in the weblink as referred in the Background papers.
- 7.3 Officer time and capacity is required to support the development of the bid. As far as possible this will coincide with existing work already underway but may require the reprioritisation of work in order to meet the 8th December deadline.
- 7.4 Consultation – A four-week community consultation exercise is proposed, which will raise awareness of our bid campaign. This will seek to engage residents, businesses, the voluntary sector, faith and political representatives and will help inform our bid submission.
- 7.5 Equalities and Diversity Implications – There are no equality and diversity implications of developing and submitting a bid for City Status. A bid would seek to identify and celebrate the diversity of Crawley's population and its aspiration for an inclusive, thriving city in the future.
- 7.6 Risk Assessment – The primary risks relating to this bid for City Status are:
- Not meeting the deadline – this is being mitigated through the establishment of an Officer Working Group to share the work involved to produce a bid
 - Not getting support – there may be people who wouldn't support Crawley becoming a city. This will need to be considered through the consultation process
 - Not securing City Status – this is a competitive process and a number of other towns have confirmed that they will also be submitting a bid for City Status. Even if the bid were not to be successful, the process of developing a submission for Crawley will provide rich data and further engender civic pride, aiding the town's recovery following the pandemic.

Agenda Item 8

8 Background Papers

- 8.1 Entry guidelines and background papers for the Platinum Jubilee Honours Competition can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/platinum-jubilee-civic-honours-competition>

Report author and contact officer:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Chief Executive
[natalie.brahma-pearl@Crawley.gov.uk](mailto:natalie.brahma-pearl@ Crawley.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

Full Council

20 October 2021

NOTICE OF MOTION 1 – MOTION AMENDING THE REQUIREMENTS OF A PROCEDURAL MOTION

Mover Councillor Lamb and Seconder Councillor Lunnon

Full Council resolves to amend section 13.1 of the Full Council Procedure Rules within Constitution, so that it reads:

All Full Council Procedure Rules, except Rules 1.2(C1) (signing of minutes) and 10.4 (holding a recorded vote), may be suspended if they receive a majority of support from members present, as set out in Rules 10.2 (majority) and 10.3 (mayor's casting vote). Suspension will only apply for the duration of that meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10

Full Council

20 October 2021

NOTICE OF MOTION 2 – LAND WEST OF IFIELD / CRAWLEY

Mover Councillor Bounds and Seconder Councillor Crow

Crawley Borough Council formally states its strongest possible opposition to the Homes England proposal to build up to 10,000 new homes to the west of Ifield/Crawley.

In doing so, this council instructs the Chief Executive to write to both Homes England and Horsham District Council on behalf of the council's entire membership, to set out the full range of concerning impacts for Crawley and the environment, including infrastructure pressures, that this development would create, and to seek both maximum mitigation measures and ongoing influence for Crawley throughout the entire process, in order to protect Crawley's interests.

This page is intentionally left blank