

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Full Council

Wednesday, 20 October 2021 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

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, S Malik, 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, B A Smith and P C Smith

Also in Attendance:

Mr Peter Nicolson and Mr Russell Brown

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Siraj Choudhury	Head of Legal, Governance and HR
Heather Girling	Head of Corporate Finance
Karen Hayes	Democratic Services Officer
Chris Pedlow	Democracy & Data Manager

1. Moment of Reflection

The Deputy Mayor held a minute of silence as a mark of respect to Sir David Amess MP, who was tragically killed on 15 October 2021. The Deputy Mayor spoke of her sadness over the murder of Sir David Amess and announced that on behalf of the Council she would be writing to Sir David's widow and family to pass on its condolences. The Deputy Mayor invited the two Group Leaders Councillors Crow and Lamb respectively to say a few words over the sad loss of Sir David. Then Councillor Millar-Smith paid her personal respects to the passing of Sir David Amess with a heartfelt tribute.

The Deputy Mayor then held a minute's silence in memory of former Mayor and Councillor Peter Milton who sadly passed in July 2021. The Deputy Mayor invited representatives from each party to pay tribute, Councillors Lanzer, C Mullins, Irvine and B Smith all paid their respects with touching tributes.

2. Disclosures of Interest

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

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 14 July 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Deputy Mayor.

4. Communications

The Deputy Mayor addressed the Full Council and thanked members across the chamber for their support since she began covering the duties of Mayor in September 2021, as it is a role she had not necessarily been expecting to take on. It was also confirmed she would be continuing to support the British Red Cross as the Mayoral Charities as previously planned for 2021-22 municipal year. She would also be supporting a local charity, SEDS – the Sussex Ehlers-Danlos Syndromes and Hypermobility Disorders Support. SEDS is a charity very close to her heart, as she came across it when accessing support personally. It was noted that the charity not only raises awareness of the condition to the public, which was particularly crucial given the often-invisible nature of it, but also effectively lobbies the local CCG to ensure that medical professionals in the local area were educated and understand the condition. The charity also provides vital support to members in answering their queries and helping them to access support. Councillor Flack commented that she was looking forward to raising some vital funds for those charities over the course of the remainder of the Council year. The Deputy Mayor also declared that her consort for the year would be Peter Lamb.

The Deputy Mayor then gave the Full Council a brief update of what she had been doing so far, including visiting the Gurdwara, to celebrate the 400th birthday of one of their gurus, attended an exhibition at Crawley Museum, put on for Black History Month and also visited Crawley Community Action which was formerly known as Crawley CVS on their 60th anniversary. It was noted that the Deputy Mayor would be at the Remembrance Service on the 14th November at St Johns Church.

In a further communication item, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Lamb confirmed that, following Councillor Fiveash having resigned from his Cabinet position, that the new Deputy Leader of the Council would be Councillor Peter Smith, who would also remain as the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development. The Leader in doing so thanked Councillor Fiveash for his work as the Deputy Leader and the Cabinet Member for Resources during this municipal year and wished him all the best in his future endeavours.

5. Public Question Time

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
Richard Symonds – Ifield Society <i>Is the 'Water Neutrality' Directive from Natural England a 'show-stopper' when it comes to large developments - such as the West of Ifield masterplan within our ancient Parish?</i>	Councillor Peter Smith – (Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development) <i>Natural England is a government agency and they sent the Council a position statement on 14 September this year which was entirely unexpected. It has an immediate effect on the Sussex North Water Supply route which is managed by</i>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p><u>Supplementary Question –</u></p> <p><i>Will Crawley Borough Council support a letter-writing campaign urging Homes England to withdraw their masterplan of 10,000 houses West of Ifield, the first phase being 3500 houses of Ifield golf course and the parish brook meadows?</i></p>	<p><i>Southern Water. The position statement applies to most of Crawley and Manor Royal and it stops the council approving new applications and giving planning applications where there is an increased water demand implication, which is of course almost all planning applications. It is preventing affordable schemes from coming forward and stopping people getting their extensions. We need to find a solution and we are cooperating with Natural England, Southern Water and other affected planning authorities to develop a Water Neutrality Strategy which will take some months to put into place. We currently have a large number of household applications that are already affected by this position statement and more coming in, together with major applications for commercial development, which is preventing investment in Crawley and potential employment. In the longer term Southern Water are proposing to install new abstraction facilities. The majority of the West of Ifield site lies in Horsham district and they will decide the planning application for this site and Crawley will only be a consultee. I cannot say what effect the Natural England position statement will have, but Homes England is a government agency and there is no guarantee that this will prevent the West of Ifield site development.</i></p> <p><i>Crawley Borough Council would encourage all those who object to the proposals to use every avenue available to ensure their voice is heard by Homes England. That could include a letter writing campaign or more importantly ensuring that they participate in any formal public consultation run by Homes England. It is important to demonstrate objections in numbers and a lack of overwhelming opposition in the public responses is likely to be used as evidence of public support when planning permission is sought.</i></p>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
Mr Khan – Bewbush	<i>In line with the Constitution, the Mayor rejected the question as it related directly to an individual's case. Mr Khan was then asked to leave the meeting due to his disruptive behaviour. After initially refusing to leave the meeting, he left the meeting before being excluded.</i>
<p>Child – Broadfield</p> <p><i>If we shut down all adventure playgrounds the normal parks aren't as safe so what do we do?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Chris Mullins – (Cabinet Member for Wellbeing)</p> <p><i>We are still about making provision for our children with good provision and facilities in Crawley. Unfortunately we have to rationalise things every now and again. We will be having good provision for children and we won't be closing 2 of the adventure playgrounds, they will be open in an unsupervised way. They will be looked after and children will still be able to go there with their parents. But they will be open for longer than the present facilities. We are looking to do things in a different way for our young people and their families.</i></p>
<p>Phil Hayes – Langley Green</p> <p><i>Councillor Mullins previously mentioned the miners' strike in 1984, as background to the Play Service, this was flourishing then, there were 11 centres which catering for all young people. I believe today's people who are now in their 40s benefited from the Play Service. The service is an important part of Crawley's lifestyle and it helps children's health and social wellbeing.</i></p> <p><u>Supplementary Question –</u></p> <p><i>How many councillors attended the 2 facilities to actually see what went on?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Brenda Smith – (Ward Councillor for Langley Green & Tushmore)</p> <p><i>Our play centres have and continued to be excellent and support young people in the town and it is vital that we continue to make those provisions for them. It is people like Phil Hayes that make our playgrounds work and who are passionate for keeping facilities for young people. He should be thanked and the other play leaders for their dedicated service.</i></p> <p><i>Two Councillors responded they had visited sites.</i></p> <p>Councillor Sue Mullins – (Ward Councillor for Langley Green & Tushmore)</p> <p><i>We owe Phil Hayes thanks especially for Cherry Lane. My children had a fantastic</i></p>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p><i>I believe in the Play Service and I believe in young people. Mental health are Covid are big issues but when children have room to play those issues are reduced. The parents get involved too and the service assists parents as well as the children.</i></p>	<p><i>time and life skills. I want children to continue to enjoy them safely. Long may the adventure playgrounds last in whatever form.</i></p>
<p>Robin Burnham – Bewbush</p> <p><i>Councillor Fiveash opposed the cuts and closures of the adventure playgrounds. He fought and won an agreement from Peter Lamb to keep the equipment in Bewbush and Broadfield adventure playgrounds and to see if within the budget there was a way to keep the adventure playgrounds going. I would stress that in order to keep the adventure playgrounds going we do need the professionals with jobs to do this and Crawley has the highest level of unemployment. The council's budget (which comes from us) is available on the council's website and the public are going to look at ways to find the finance for the sites: it needs to be for all 4 sites. Can I have an assurance from the council that when these suggestions from the public are brought in with regards to the finance to be found that they are considered please?</i></p> <p><u>Supplementary Question –</u></p> <p><i>For clarification was that a 'yes' that the council will let the public have its voice?</i></p> <p><i>I live in Bewbush and myself and other residents were not aware of the consultation, not a phone call or leaflet.</i></p>	<p>Councillor Peter Lamb – (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>We did modify the proposal following Councillor's Fiveash's request, which amended the decision to 'mothball' them as opposed to progress them into something else. We are continuing to try and find ways to preserve all 4 sites or bring some back depending on what options are presented. I would heartedly encourage every person in the community to go through the council's budget in detail as people will be surprised just how challenging the current situation is. Just over 10 years' ago we had a budget 3 times that we do now. The fact that we are still able to pick up people's bins weekly is remarkable. When we consulted that was the issue that residents were most keen on preserving over all other considerations. I am happy for people to look through the budget and we will consider suggestions. This is the first set of cuts carried out in 7 years, triggered by the pandemic and we have not been left with any other option and it is not being done because we want to but because we have to.</i></p> <p><i>We have already allowed the public to have its voice and will continue to do so. We will consider suggestions but we cannot stop council decisions in February where it will impact on delivery of services and quality of life.</i></p>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p>Leila Mill – Broadfield</p> <p><i>It is upsetting for me personally that my children's future and our children's future is on the backburner of bins being collected. I didn't receive any leaflets I didn't know about the consultation. Phil was to me in my childhood, what these lovely people are to my children. The importance of the adventure playground being supervised is major and to go and be independent and to learn life skills away from their parents. I can take my kids to any park but the fact that they get to go to these places where there is independence for them to learn is heavenly. Are we going to have something inside the town centre that is supervised similar to previous?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Chris Mullins – (Cabinet Member for Wellbeing)</p> <p><i>It is not a decision we want to do, and if we were in a different situation we would do things differently. But we are looking at how we can still make good provision for our children. We understand the importance of health and wellbeing and we are looking at alternatives throughout the town. That's the reason we are going to run 2 of the sites unsupervised until we can find alternative approaches. We cannot find finance for staffing all the adventure playgrounds any longer.</i></p>

6. Petitions - "the closure and change of use for the Millpond site at Bewbush and the site at Cherry Lane, Langley Green"

The Full Council considered an e-petition, submitted via change.org and in a CSV format, received by the Council's Petitions Officer. As the petition contained over 1000 (approximately 1950) valid signatures it was required to be debated by Full Council. The petition stated as follows "On the closure and change of use for the Millpond site at Bewbush and the site at Cherry Lane, Langley Green".

"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"

Councillors were informed that as the Full Council was the decision maker regarding the changes to the Adventure Playgrounds as a clearly identifiable saving within the Budget setting report and therefore, the Full Council retained the decision making power in respect of the petition before them. The Deputy Mayor reminded Members that the Constitution limits debates on petitions to 30 minutes per meeting.

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

Councillor C Mullins, as Cabinet Member for Wellbeing addressed the meeting, thanking the Principal Petitioner for submitting the petition. Councillor C Mullins, then made the following points including:

- Reiterated it was a difficult decision to make but the council was in a challenging financial situation as a result of the pandemic.
- It was planned to 'mothball' two sites, with others as unsupervised. It was noted that the staffing figure was not attainable.
- The unsupervised sites would mean that there would be more available.
- It was acknowledged that the service was governed by the HSE and has to ensure that the standard of equipment meets the highest specification.
- Following the serious accident a few years' ago at Cherry Lane adventure playground all equipment was removed, albeit equipment that had been passed by the HSE. In order to meet safety standards equipment costs are in excess of £200,000 per site and consequently refurbishment programme and equipment costs are not feasible.

The Deputy Mayor then opened the debate to the floor.

Councillor Crow's comments included –

- Covid has changed how services are run.
- Health and safety has changed and affected ways of working and it now becomes more expensive to provide a service.
- It is not a decision that the Council wanted to take, it was a decision that resulted from public consultation. Preserving weekly bin collection was a greater priority for the Council but other options could come forward and be costed, then those should be investigated.

Councillor Jones' comments included –

- Never wanted to reduce services and some difficult decisions had to be made.
- Cabinet Members had been responsive to residents and ward Councillors.
- Wanted to maintain Millpond to remain open as a play area.
- There was a balance to be made between the concerns with what could be achieved.
- There would be an outreach play service that would go out to areas across the Borough.
- There was a need to see what possibilities were with community groups taking over the remaining sites and would be an interesting opportunity to explore.

Councillor Lanzer's comments included –

- Despite the amount of additional Covid funding, the severity of the financial situation should not be underestimated.
- The ability to maintain the sites proved costly.
- It was remarked again that each playground attendance costs the taxpayer £30 and there had been a 68% reduction in attendance since 2002/2003 and that to keep all 4 adventure playgrounds open would cost £500,000 of initial investment to bring them up to standard.
- Any community group or commercial enterprise that enters into this process with the facts as an investment would be required to bring the adventure playgrounds up to the required standard particularly in the area of health and safety. Plus an ongoing commitment to either fund attendance to £30 per head (if all 4 sites were opened) or a combination of charging.
- There was full consultation on the budget prior to February 2021, and the refuse collection service there was held in high regard but there is an opportunity for this Council to lead on this (particularly now whilst in tight political control). There would be a time when switching to fortnightly collections was inevitable, which would increase recycling and also provide a saving which could be used on other services.

Councillor S Mullins' comments included –

- Passionate about the adventure playgrounds, they were important now and in the future. But we need to be practical. The budget and finances make for poor reading and books need to be balanced.
- Biggest complaint received about the adventure playgrounds, was that 'when I go they were closed'. The compromise was the unsupervised sites as the equipment and sites will still be there for use.

Councillor Fiveash's comments included –

- Adventure playgrounds are vital in Crawley and the decision to close Bewbush was taken too quickly. To keep Waterlea open and Bewbush closed just defied logic given the numbers within the deprived neighbourhoods.
- Furnace Green residents have Tilgate Park a few minutes' walk away.
- The community want them back and want to run them for the benefit of the community so the people who are passionate about the sites are available and we need to listen to the people we claim to represent.
- Losing these provisions increases youth crime.

Councillor B Burgess' comments included –

- The parents benefit as well from attending the play sites.
- Think there is an opportunity to outsource the provision of the play service.

The Deputy Mayor informed the Full Council that the 30 minutes was about to end and as such the last speaker on the petition, would be the Leader of the Council.

Councillor Lamb's comments included –

- Clear from debate that this issue means a lot to the town. The sites were a premier attraction for children in the town. Unfortunately, times have changed and levels of use have reduced.
- Consultation took place during a pandemic however it did cover the whole town and received the highest levels of feedback.
- There was a legal requirement to balance the budget.
- A community group could take over the sites the council will work with the groups to look towards this possibility, however they would need to meet all legislative and regulatory requirements including health and safety. Sites that are not staying open are being 'mothballed', two sites to become unsupervised.
- There had been heightened correspondence on this matter, of which they made it clear that there were two sites that have been paramount in people's minds that is Cherry Lane and the Millpond.

Councillor Lamb in closing the petition debate then moved a recommendation *Option D – Make any other recommendations relating to the petition to the Full Council for its consideration*. He proposed as his alternative option that the original Full Council decision that Cherry Lane and Waterlea be retained for unsupervised play, be changed, namely, that Cherry Lane and the Millpond be retained as unsupervised play.

He commented part of the rationale behind this Option D proposal was down to the heightened correspondence he and others had received over the importance of retaining both Cherry Lane and the Millpond.

Councillor C Mullins' then seconded the proposal.

The Deputy Mayor then invited members to put forward alternative options for the Full Council to vote upon.

Councillor Crow's comments included –

- Would support Option B. The option to switch which sites and equipment would be remaining is a larger body of work. Option D had not been scrutinised, there was no evidence and discussion or public consultation. It would not be good governance.
- Option B would still allow this approach and could allow further scrutiny to take place and the decision being taken in November.

Councillor Ali's comments included –

- Good gesture to keep sites open but just to switch sites at the last minute was not a fair decision and has not included any public consultation. The people that use Waterlea believe that site will be kept open.

Councillor Ayling's comments included –

- Attended the Millpond and upon speaking to the parents they were able to voice their dissatisfaction. The site was well used and the children were enjoying the facilities.
- Had a public meeting to discuss options and we are aware of the financial implications but need to find a way forward.

Councillor McCarthy's comments included –

- It was unfair to switch a play area where people aren't represented in the chamber. The proposal moved has not had any scrutiny and the geographical implications have not been considered.

The Deputy Mayor then invited the Head of Legal, Governance and HR as the Monitoring Officer to confirm what had been moved during the debate and provided any advice he feels was necessary. The Monitoring Officer, addressed the meeting stating that the 'proposal moved by Councillor Lamb and seconded by Councillor C Mullins proposed making changes to sites made by Full Council in February 2021 as part of identified savings. More than 6 months had passed so it was possible to make a change as long as it was a Full Council decision. Point has been made about scrutiny, Options B and C were in the report about referring to Cabinet and to have some detailed considerations of data, financial implications, health and safety and equality impact assessments which may arise from whatever course of action is taken. It is an opportunity to obtain professional advice from officers in the form of a report. By taking a decision tonight, which is the proposal, (Option D), Councillors would be making a decision based on the information acquired tonight during the course of the debate. The risk of that was there may be some material considerations which may be missed. It is difficult at this point to assess what those material considerations might be. The Deputy Mayor, as the Chair will take a view as to whether members are equipped to make the decision and members should be encouraged to do the same. Members should be reminded that within the Code of Conduct members are encouraged to use best evidence when making decisions.'

Councillor Crow then formally moved Option B to refer the matter back to Cabinet which could potentially look at the switching of sites, but not predetermine it. Councillor McCarthy seconded the proposal.

The Deputy Mayor called for votes on the proposals as to how to respond to the petition, and the votes would occur in the order that they had been moved during the debate. Clarity was also then provided to the Principal Petitioner and the public present as to what was happening, in terms of what each of the proposals being voted upon would mean in practical terms.

The Deputy Mayor stated that as there were multiple options moved it would not be possible for an unanimous decision on the petition. So in line Council Procedure Rule F.4, all votes on the petitions were required to be a recorded vote.

The Deputy Mayor invited the Democracy and Data Manager to administer the recorded vote on Councillor Lamb's proposal of Option D and the alternative recommendation that the original decision that Cherry Lane and Waterlea be retained for unsupervised play, be changed by Council, namely that Cherry Lane and the Millpond be retained as unsupervised play.

Voting in Favour: Councillors: Ayling, Buck, Fiveash, Flack, Irvine, Jhans, Nawaz, Jones, Khan, Lamb, Lunnon, Malik, C Mullins, S Mullins, Pickett, Raja, B Smith, P Smith (18)

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

Abstentions: (0)

Having put it to the vote which resulted in a tie, the Deputy Mayor used her casting vote to vote in support of the proposal, moved by Councillor Lamb.

RESOLVED

That the Council approves Option D, an alternative recommendation that its original decision that Cherry Lane and Waterlea be retained for unsupervised play, be changed, namely that Cherry Lane and the Millpond be retained as unsupervised play.

Councillor Burrett raised a point of order, and asked that it be recorded over the decision taken by the Full Council, that 'this Council has now taken a decision without a relevant report and without the regard of taking officer advice. Where does that leave that decision?'

The Monitoring Officer reconfirmed that the interpretation of the Constitution was down to the Chair, the Deputy Mayor, and as a result the Full Council has proceeded with approving the proposal and thus made a valid decision.

7. Procedural Motion to suspend a particular Full Council Procedure Rule - to suspend the Chair's casting vote.

Councillor Crow put forward a Procedural Motion in accordance with Full Council Procedure Rules, to suspend a particular Full Council Procedure Rule, namely the Chair's casting vote. This was seconded by Councillor McCarthy.

The Deputy Mayor sought advice on the Procedural Motion from the Head of Legal, Governance and HR as the Monitoring Officer.

The Monitoring Officer commented that Councillor Crow was proposing to use Procedural Motion 13.1 to suspend the Mayor's casting vote and a similar Procedural Motion at the AGM. However, paragraph 8.1 of the introduction of the Council's

Constitution states *that the purpose of any suspension should be to enhance the democratic process and not to restrict it*. Referring to the Local Government Act 1972 s39 this covers meetings and proceedings of Local Government and that requires Local Government business to be dealt with by a simple majority and that includes use of the casting vote in the event of a tie. That is the democratic process set out by legislation and Crawley's constitution aligns with that. Departing from that, and using the procedural motion you are wishing, would restrict democratic process which would remove a well-established process for removing deadlock. On that basis, the advice of the Monitoring Officer was that the Deputy Mayor does not allow the vote on this procedural motion and continue with the business of the meeting.

In response Councillor Crow, commented that the casting vote had just been used to hinder the democratic process as a decision had just been taken with the Deputy Mayor's casting vote that had not been scrutinised.

The Deputy Mayor responded by, thanking Councillor Crow, stating that his last point had been noted and that she would be following the Monitoring Officer's advice to not allow the procedural motion for the same reasons provided.

8. Review of May 2021 Polling Arrangements - Recommendation 1

The Full Council considered report [LDS/171](#) of the Head of Legal, Governance and HR which requested Members 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.

The item had been previously considered at the Governance Committee on 21 September 2021. Councillor McCarthy moved the recommendation which was seconded and supported by Councillor Burrett.

Councillor Lunnon moved and presented the amendment, (Amendment 1) to the Recommendation, seconded by Cllr Lamb, which was:

That the Full Council be recommended to approve the proposed Polling Scheme (as being proposed in Recommendation 1) with the following changes:

*(The new words are in **Bold** and words crossed through to be removed)*

Polling District	Borough Ward	County Division	Polling Station	Electorate (Sept 2021)	Postal Voters	Polling Station Voters
LAB	Bewbush and North Broadfield	Broadfield	Broadfield Scout Hut Broadfield Community Centre	970	232	738
LBB	Broadfield	Broadfield	Creasys Drive Adventure Playground Broadfield Community Centre	2651	696	1955
LEB	Gossops Green and	Broadfield	Broadfield Scout Hut	828	299	529

	North-East Broadfield		Broadfield Community Centre			
LJA	Pound Hill North and Forge Wood	Pound Hill	Milton Mount Community Centre The Grattons Indoors Bowls Club	2872	649	2223

In response to Councillor Lunnon's amendment Councillor McCarthy tabled a further amendment (Amendment 2) from the floor, which was seconded by Councillor Burrett:

That the Full Council be recommended to approve the proposed Polling Scheme (as being proposed in Recommendation 1) with the following changes:

*(The new words are in **Bold** and words crossed through to be removed)*

Polling District	Borough Ward	County Division	Polling Station	Electorate (Sept 2021)	Postal Voters	Polling Station Voters
LAB	Bewbush and North Broadfield	Broadfield	Broadfield Scout Hut Broadfield Community Centre	970	232	738
LBB	Broadfield	Broadfield	Creasys Drive Adventure Playground Broadfield Community Centre	2651	696	1955
LEB	Gossops Green and North-East Broadfield	Broadfield	Broadfield Scout Hut Broadfield Community Centre	828	299	529
LJA	Pound Hill North and Forge Wood	Pound Hill	The Grattons Indoors Bowls Club	2872	649	2223

The Deputy Mayor invited Councillor Lunnon to respond to the tabled amendment, where he confirmed that he would be willing to withdraw Amendment 1 and instead second Councillor McCarthy's proposal, if he included the Amendment 2 as part of substantive proposal that would be put to the Full Council for its consideration.

Councillor McCarthy, then moved to the Recommendation 1 with the inclusion of Amendment 2, which was seconded by Councillor Lunnon.

With no further speakers the Deputy Mayor called for a vote, which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

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 Scout Hut	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	Creasys Drive Adventure Playground	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 Scout Hut	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	Maidenbower Community Centre*	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
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

9. Crawley City Status Bid - Recommendation 2

The Full Council considered report [CEx/56](#) of the Chief Executive. Councillor Lamb, as the Leader of the Council, introduced the report that sought agreement for preparation and submission of a bid for 'City Status', for Crawley, as part of the Platinum Jubilee Civic Honours Competition, which was part of the celebrations marking the Queen's 70 years (Platinum Jubilee) on the throne. It was noted that in 2022 Crawley would be celebrating its 75th anniversary (Diamond Jubilee) as a New Town and it would be fitting to celebrate both events with Crawley receiving 'City Status.'

Councillor Crow seconded the recommendation.

Councillor Lanzer also spoke on the item and in support of the recommendation.

RESOLVED

That Full Council agrees

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

10. Notice of Motion 1 - Motion Amending the Requirements of a Procedural Motion

The Council considered the [Notice of Motion 1](#) – Motion Amending the Requirements of a Procedural Motion as set out on page 93 of the Full Council's agenda.

The Motion was moved and presented by Councillor Lamb and doing so gave further explanation on the reasoning behind the Notice of Motion, which was seconded by Councillor Lunnon.

Councillor Crow was then invited to move the Conservative Amendment to Notice of Motion 1. Councillor Crow commented that he would not be moving the published amendment yet, instead moving from the Full Council Procedures Rules a Procedural Amendment, 11.1F *To refer something to an appropriate body or individual*, namely that Full Council resolves to refer the Motion to the Governance Committee for detailed consideration including an officer report.

Councillor McCarthy seconded the Procedural Motion.

11. Vote to Extend the Meeting (Guillotine)

As the business had not been completed within the scheduled 2 hours 30 minutes a vote on continuation, and in line with Council Procedure Rule 8.3, was held. The Deputy Mayor required the Full Council to consider if it wished to continue with the meeting.

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

12. Notice of Motion 1 - Motion Amending the Requirements of a Procedural Motion - (Continued)

Following the agreement of the Full Council to continue the meeting, the Deputy Mayor restarted the discussion on the Notice of Motion 1 – Motion Amending the Requirements of A Procedural Motion and Councillor Crow's moved Procedural Motion.

Councillor Lunnon responded to the Procedural Motion, and in doing so spoke, against it as he felt it duplicated the previous discussion earlier during the meeting (item 7) regarding the use of the Chair's/ Deputy Mayor's casting vote.

The Deputy Mayor sought advice on the Procedural Motion from the Head of Legal, Governance and HR as the Monitoring Officer, who commented that there was a technical point as to what the appropriate body (referred to in 11.1F) for constitutional amendments would be. Ultimately the Full Council had the responsibility, but it does delegate discussion on the constitution to the Governance Committee. The Monitoring Officer's advice given on the use (and potential suspension) of the Chair's casting vote an earlier in the meeting (item 7) remained the same and it was stressed that that advice would be provided to the Governance Committee or Full Council.

The Deputy Mayor invited any further comments on the Procedural Motion and on the Notice of Motion. Councillor Burrett spoke in support on the Procedural Motion.

The Deputy Mayor accepted Councillor Crow's proposed Procedural Motion re: 11.1F *To refer something to an appropriate body or individual*, namely the discussion on the proposed Constitutional change to the Governance Committee, and put it to the vote.

There were 18 votes in favour and 18 against with 0 abstentions.

Having put it to the vote which resulted in a tie, the Deputy Mayor used her casting vote to decide against the Procedural Motion and declared that the Procedural Motion re: 11.1F had fallen by 19 votes against the motion and 18 for the motion and 0 abstentions.

Following an invitation from the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Crow then moved the [Conservative Amendment](#), (as published in *Supplementary Agenda Order Paper*). The proposed amendment was 'Full Council resolves to refer to the Governance Committee for detailed consideration, as per the usual practice for changes to the constitution, the following proposed change to section 13.1 of the Full Council Procedure Rules within the 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.'

Councillor Burrett seconded the amendment and spoke on the Amendment.

Councillors Lunnon, B Burgess, and McCarthy all spoke on the debate on the Notice of Motion and the Amendment.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the Conservative Amendment to Notice of Motion 1 – Motion Amending the Requirements of a Procedural Motion

There were 18 votes in favour and 18 against with 0 abstentions.

Having put it to the vote which resulted in a tie, the Deputy Mayor used her casting vote to decide against the Conservative Amendment and declared that the amendment had fallen by 19 votes against the motion and 18 for the motion and 0 abstentions.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the Notice of Motion 1 – Motion Amending the Requirements of a Procedural Motion

There were 18 votes in favour and 18 against with 0 abstentions.

Having put it to the vote which resulted in a tie, the Deputy Mayor used her casting vote to decide in favour and declared that the Notice of Motion 1 – Motion Amending the Requirements of a Procedural Motion had been carried.

RESOLVED

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.

13. Notice of Motion 2 - Land West of Ifield / Crawley

The Council considered the [Notice of Motion 2](#) – Land West of Ifield/ Crawley as set out on page 95 of the Full Council's agenda.

The Motion was moved and presented by Councillor Bounds and in doing so gave further explanation on the reasoning behind the Notice of Motion and the need for the Council to show its objection to the proposed development on the land west of Ifield/ Crawley. Councillor Crow seconded the Motion.

Councillor P Smith then moved and presented the [Labour Amendment](#) (as shown in *Supplementary Agenda Order Paper*). The Amendment was seconded by Councillor Lamb who also spoke on the item.

14. Vote to Extend the Meeting (Guillotine)

As the business had not been completed within the additional period of 30 minutes after the vote on continuation, and in line with Council Procedure Rule 8.3, the Deputy Mayor required the Full Council to consider if it wished to continue with the meeting and having put it to the Full Council, the meeting was continued for an additional period not exceeding 30 minutes.

15. Notice of Motion 2 - Land West of Ifield / Crawley (continued)

Following the agreement of the Full Council to continue the meeting, the Deputy Mayor restarted the discussion on the Notice of Motion 2 – Land West of Ifield/ Crawley and the related amendment and held a single debate on both elements.

Councillors Crow, Irvine, Burrett, Lanzer and S Mullins all spoke during the debate, as did Councillor Bounds using his right to reply, emphasising that he had hoped that his Notice of Motion would have been seen as apolitical, and whilst it had not been seen that way, it was pleasing that all Members appear to be against the proposed West of Ifield development.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the Labour Amendment to Notice of Motion 2 – Land West of Ifield/ Crawley.

There were 18 votes in favour and 18 against with 0 abstentions.

Having put it to the vote which resulted in a tie, the Deputy Mayor used her casting vote to decide in favour of the Labour Amendment and declared that the amendment had been carried by 19 votes against the motion and 18.

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

RESOLVED

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

The Council congratulates the administration for having written some time ago 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 seeking both maximum mitigation measures and ongoing influence for Crawley throughout the entire process, in order to protect Crawley's interests.

Receiving the Minutes of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Other Committees

Moved by Councillor Flack the Deputy Mayor –

RESOLVED

That the following reports be received:

Audit Committee – 19 July 2021

Planning Committee – 20 July 2021

Planning Committee – 31 August 2021

Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 6 September 2021

Cabinet – 8 September 2021

Licensing Committee – 13 September 2021

Governance Committee – 21 September 2021

Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 27 September 2021

Cabinet – 29 September 2021

17. Councillors' Questions Time

Name of Councillor asking Question	Name of Cabinet Member Responding
<p>Councillor Crow to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>Does he share my view that the reputation of this council and that of Crawley was damaged by events at the Tushmore roundabout in July this year and the fact that it took the Mayor 7 weeks to resign?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb – (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>I believe that the Mayor did the right thing in resigning and I think that draws a line under that particular issue.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Lunnon to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>At the last meeting we talked about honouring Gareth Southgate and I wondered how progress on that was going?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb – (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>We are close to an announcement on this, there is a proposal (of which the Leader of the Opposition is aware). There are some legal requirements to attend to but it is hoped that the proposal can be announced soon.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Eade to the Cabinet Member for Housing</p> <p><i>What preparations the council has in place for the shutdown of the analogue telephone lines and the transfer to digitaluk in 2025? What preparations are being made for the Lifeline machines in the future and replacement</i></p>	<p>Councillor Irvine – (Cabinet Member for Housing)</p> <p><i>I'm afraid I don't have the answer to hand. Procedurally it would have been better as a written question but I will take up the queries you have raised and endeavour to come back to you with the answers.</i></p>

<p><i>machines for the residents that have them now and how it will affect the telephone extension numbers?</i></p>	
<p>Councillor Brenda Burgess to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement</p> <p><i>Please can you provide an update as to the council's plans to re-settle Afghan refugees</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jones – (Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Community Engagement)</p> <p><i>We are aware of the role that is being undertaken, I believe Kent CC is the primary authority and we liaise with key organisations.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Peck to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>Kingsgate car park was used by many people and was managed by NCP. Please can the Cabinet Member confirm that the car park will be open for Christmas shopping? Will he be able to meet with me as we have other car parks managed by NCP, as they terminated their lease unexpectedly so there is a concern that these other car parks operated by NCP may terminate their lease with the land providers leaving Crawley with a lack of car parks.</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jhans – (Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability)</p> <p><i>NCP did terminate their lease quickly and the council will be trying to reopen the car park prior to Christmas. I am not aware of other issues regarding the other car parks but I am happy to meet with you and officers to discuss further.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Piggott to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>As Leader of the Council do you feel that residents deserve, in addition to a Deputy Mayor, a full and substantive Mayor at this time?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb – (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>We are legally required to operate within the 1972 Local Government Act, which does not provide a mechanism for mid-year elections.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Ali to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability</p> <p><i>What is the situation with regards to the resources in the Civil Enforcement Team? And would he consider more resources going into Southgate and Gossops Green controlled parking zones particularly around the school times?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jhans – (Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability)</p> <p><i>Interesting question as the council was approached by Gossops Green school to trial safer school streets to allow walking and cycling around school roads. This could be followed up again. As for the Civil Enforcement Officers, everyone knows they are stretched but I am happy to bring up with the team.</i></p>

<p>Councillor Lanzer to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>Given the council's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2050 by virtue of its own operations, and given the uncertainties in the energy supply market, what options are available for accelerating the study of alternatives for the district heat network?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb – (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>At the moment hydrogen would not be a cheaper alternative to gas. It is more likely to be 'blue hydrogen' where it is added into the gas in the short term. Realities of the energies prices as we transition to a green economy is that it is going to equate to higher costs. Green solutions need to be cost effective.</i></p>
--	---

18. Guillotine and End of the Meeting

The Deputy Mayor informed the Full Council that as the business of the meeting had not been completed by 11.00pm, and in line with Council Procedure Rule 8.4, the guillotine must fall and the meeting was to end.

It was noted that the only item on the agenda that not been completed and could not be dealt with following the falling of guillotine was *Items For Debate – Review of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy, Licensing Committee, 13 September 2021 (Minute 4) – Conservative Group*.

The Deputy Mayor closed the meeting.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Full Council concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 11.00 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Disclosures of Interest Received

Councillor	Item and Minute	Meeting	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor Ayling	Planning application CR/2018/0064/FUL – Land Parcel Broadwood Rise, Broadfield, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	Personal interest – member of West Sussex County Council and Chair of the Planning and Rights of Way Committee.
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2018/0064/FUL – Land Parcel Broadwood Rise, Broadfield, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	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)	Planning Committee 20 July 2021	Personal Interest – Local Authority Director of the Manor Royal Business Improvement District.
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2021/0174/FUL – Land at Faraday Road & Manor Royal, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 31 August 2021	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)	Planning Committee 31 August 2021	Personal interest – Cabinet Member for Housing.
Councillor Lanzer	Community Grants Procedure & Outcomes Framework (Minute 4)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 27 September 2021	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC

Councillor Lanzer	HASC (Minute 6)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 27 September 2021	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burrett	HASC (Minute 6)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 27 September 2021	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	HASC (Minute 6)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 27 September 2021	Personal Interest – WSCC Cabinet Member for Public Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Bounds	Notice Of Motion 2 – Land West Of Ifield / Crawley – Agenda item 10	Full Council 20 October 2021	Personal Interest – Member (in his personal capacity) of the Save the West of Ifield Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B

Principal Petitioner Speech – Natalie Campbell

Firstly, thank you for hearing our petition and allowing us to share our views and passions about the Mill adventure playground in Bewbush with you all. Since starting the petition. I have gained support from Dan at Spotted Media Services, Dean at Sessions Radio, and the team at Delta Security Management to form the community initiative that has supported and helped drive this campaign to Save the Mill at Bewbush.

As a community collaboration we believe that the Mill is worth saving. It is the hub of a diverse town and provides vital services to families who need them. It is also a safe place for our future generations to grow, learn and develop in a safe and positive environment.

As a hub, we believe that these services should be handed back to the community to run and support, in collaboration with various volunteer networks and businesses that are passionate about what they stand for.

With new developments of houses and neighbourhoods being built all over Crawley it seems ludicrous that they start removing facilities to support these communities.

Crawley is such a diverse town with lots of different cultures living and growing together all needing very different supports. A hub like the Adventure playground can be used to help families when they are at their most vulnerable. Having kids is the hardest job in the world and having somewhere to go to just meet and talk to other parents and carers is such a relief and a support. Knowing you are not the only one in a situation or talking best practices can mean the making not breaking of a parent!

For the older children it's a place of safety, so they are not hanging out at the local shopping parades, or the streets getting into trouble. Its somewhere we can offer life skills, support, and most of all memories of a great childhood for them.

We are proposing to support this community-based initiative, not only in the short term, however for future generations, just like the previous generations have benefitted from before.

The decision to close the Mill, which covers a much wider catchment would affect the following areas: Bewbush, Ifield, Gossops Green, Broadfield, Kilnwood Vale and not excluding the wider community in Crawley. To remove these services as they stand would affect such a large area of these communities and future generations of the town, we just can't support the council's decision and urge that we work with you to make the Community initiative a feasible option.

We aim to prove and show that his facility is required for the future generations of the community. Run by the community for the community and the greater

good of our town. We want to offer life skills to kids who may not have that opportunity in other environments and who may find that the environment of the hub is more absorbing. It needs to be a safe place for kids and families alike and a place where the community can come together to support each other and celebrate.

Its also more than just saving the site, its also securing it for future generations. Its about investing in our future communities who will become our employees, business owners, leaders and they will in turn continue to make Crawley a place to stay and be proud of. The site needs to be self-sufficient, giving an opportunity for local businesses to contribute to the site, offering services in childcare, advise and support all in the name of giving back.

The site has so much potential which we want to expand on this. Working with local business and organisations we can offer more services and support through planned activities, and events. Through local media and social media these events can reach a wider audience and into communities that may not know about the services it can offer.

The community and local business feel that the Mill needs to be saved for the future generations of the town. If we can make the Mill work as per our plan, we can then roll this strategy out at other sites so safe places to play can be available for anyone to access.

In conclusion, we are not going away, and we are going to fight to keep this facility open for the community run by the community, for the benefit of the community.