

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Full Council

Wednesday, 30 March 2022 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 Mwangale, A Nawaz, D M Peck, A Pendlington, S Piggott, B A Smith and P C Smith

Also in Attendance:

Mr Peter Nicolson	Independent Person
Mr Russell Brown	Independent Person

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl	Chief Executive
Siraj Choudhury	Head of Legal, Governance and HR
Heather Girling	Democratic Services Officer
Mez Matthews	Democratic Services Officer

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor M W Pickett and S Raja

1. Disclosures of Interest

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

2. Minutes - Full Council 23 February 2022

The minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 23 February 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Deputy Mayor.

3. Minutes - Extraordinary Full Council 2 March 2022

The minutes of the meeting of the Extraordinary Full Council held on 2 March 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Deputy Mayor.

4. Communications

The Head of Legal, Governance and HR addressed the Full Council and spoke in respect of the limited attendance at the Full Council meetings held on the [15 December 2021](#) and [2 March 2022](#). It had been agreed prior to those meetings that the number of Councillors present be limited on health and safety grounds for the December meeting following the rise in the number of Covid cases at that time and due to the extraordinary and urgent nature of the March meeting. As such, the reason for the absence of all Councillors listed as having sent their apologies was clearly stated in those minutes. However, it has been acknowledged that those Councillors' attendance figures would have been affected by those arrangements so, for those Councillors who had not been required to attend, the Democratic Services Team has identified a way of adjusting the 'Expected' status in the Modern.gov system to ensure that attendance records were not negatively affected.

The Deputy Mayor updated the Council on events since the last meeting. The British Down Syndrome Swimming Championships would be held at K2 Crawley later in the year and a launch event had been held to capture the interest and enthusiasm generated by the fantastic performance of athletes. There had also been the opportunity to watch the Forward Motion dance performances. The Deputy Mayor also spoke about the Easter Egg Drive with Spotted Crawley and the ongoing effort for Ukraine.

To conclude, Councillor Brenda Smith was thanked for her long and dedicated service with the Authority and the town as this was her last meeting of the Full Council.

5. Public Question Time

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p>Karen Sudan - Ifield</p> <p>My question relates to the Leader's column in the Crawley Observer today, but I think it's directed to the Cabinet Member for Housing. In the column the Leader has referred to the cost-of-living crisis and mentioned how it is causing hardship in Crawley because of low income and high housing costs. I would like to ask if he would agree that charging council tenants higher rents is exacerbating this hardship?</p>	<p>Councillor Ian Irvine <i>(Cabinet Member for Housing)</i></p> <p>I know we share a passion for council housing and the people that rent them. When renting a council house it's important to look at the whole picture. I regret that council rents have to rise but I believe that Crawley provides a very good housing service as the people that rent the houses do not have to pay for them to be maintained. But that housing service has to be paid for and if we do not put up the council rents then that housing service does not have as much money as it should have. This year we have been faced with enormous challenges, rising costs of raw materials for example, and we certainly do not want a failing housing service. I receive a lot of emails about housing but I have not received communication from tenants saying they cannot afford the rent. The communications are from those</p>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p>Supplementary Question – More money has gone into the Housing Revenue Account because the Council are charging the higher affordable rent for new tenancies. Does that extra amount match the amount lost to the Housing Revenue Account because the rents from the garages no longer go into the Housing Revenue Account?</p>	<p>desperate to be on the housing register. Crawley Homes needs to be a forward-looking organisation.</p> <p>The Housing Revenue Account is a dynamic account as there is money coming in and out. When garages was transferred to the General Fund, which is something that nearly every other council has done, it was carried out during the first year of Covid during a challenging year for council finances . Some of the money that gets generated from the affordable rents can get put back into building new council properties which is something the Council had to be proud of.</p>
<p>Winnie Duggan, Ifield</p> <p>Have any new council homes been built in Crawley since 2012 for which tenants have not been charged the affordable rent?</p> <p>Supplementary Question – Does the Cabinet Member accept that using the term 'affordable' implies the existence of 'unaffordable', at least for some people? What are Crawley people expected to do if we can't afford to live here?</p>	<p>Councillor Ian Irvine <i>(Cabinet Member for Housing)</i></p> <p>I have only been the Cabinet Member for Housing for 3 years, but I believe houses at Forge Wood are not affordable council properties.</p> <p>I'm not entirely sure how the terms 'affordable' and 'social rent' have made their way into the language. I prefer 'council rent'. People complain about affordable rents, but it has never been raised with me that tenants cannot afford their rent and people do seem happy with what the Council are doing. The tenants seem to be satisfied with service they received for their rent.</p>
<p>Robin Burnham – Bewbush</p> <p>Dissatisfaction was expressed with regards to how the initial petition process had conducted with regard to the petition "We Need Truly Affordable, Publicly Owned Homes for Crawley People". Will you be accountable to the public by moving 20 July meeting to a bigger venue, either K2 Crawley or the Hawth? As of today about 200 households have said they want to attend. I would like to hear Councillors' views on a bigger</p>	<p>Operational matter: Head of Legal, Governance & HR</p> <p>It is an operational matter in terms of arranging a venue for the July meeting. We are currently still in March, and July is someway off and the logistics and arrangements will be reviewed nearer the time. We cannot predict what the Covid situation will be in July, hopefully it will be much improved but, for those reasons and those in last 24 months, arrangements around meetings are in constant review.</p>

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p>venue.</p> <p>Supplementary Question – I did respectfully ask if any Councillor wanted to be accountable to the public and whether they would want to consider a bigger venue.</p>	<p>Councillor Brenda Burgess I believe Mr Burnham is asking for an opinion on a larger venue. If we are going to have a large number of people, we need to keep an open mind and personally think it may be a good idea to consider it.</p> <p>Councillor Millar-Smith I have always felt that engagement between the Council and our tenants is important and if a large number wish to attend this should be accommodated.</p> <p>Councillor Ian Irvine <i>(Cabinet Member for Housing)</i> If the numbers warrant a larger number then it's something to look into. But, just on the issue of providing housing, the Labour party are looking to continue to provide public housing in Crawley.</p> <p>The Deputy Mayor summarised that venue location will be identified and confirmed closer to the date of the July meeting once logistics and arrangements have been identified.</p>

6. **Crawley Towns Fund Project Business Cases - PART B (Recommendation 1)**

The Deputy Mayor informed the Full Council that it was the intention to hold the discussion on Recommendation 1 – Crawley Towns Fund Project Business Cases (report PES/399 of the Head of Economy and Planning) from the Cabinet held on 16 March 2022 in Open – Public Session (Part A), noting that the report was an exempt report.

The report had sought approval of the business cases for various Town Fund projects as set out in the Crawley Town Investment Plan Heads of Terms (confirmed by the Government in July 2021). It was recognised that the businesses would hope to attract and retain opportunities within the borough to enable residents' employment prospects. It was also noted that whilst the town had been through challenging times resulting from the pandemic it was now important to invest in alternative skills and diversify the economy. Councillor Lamb moved the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor P Smith, who thanked officers for their work on the project.

Councillors Crow and Lanzer also spoke in support of the recommendation.

At the end of the item, Councillor Lanzer took the opportunity to thank Councillor P Smith for his work on the programme, partnership work and the Planning and Economic Development Cabinet portfolio, as this was to be his last Council meeting.

Councillor P Smith stated it had been an honour to be a Cabinet Member and he felt proud of what had been achieved.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves to the following items:

- a) to add the following new capital schemes to the capital programme and the respective capital allocations to each project as set out below, worth a total of £18.1m, subject to a viable business case and to the receipt of the Towns Fund government funding.
 - 1B – “Invest in Skills for Crawley” - Skills training facilities - £4.4m
 - 1C – Green Tech Business Grants / Business Premises green retrofit - £2m
 - 2A – Crawley Bus Station Transformation - £2m
 - 2B – Town Centre-Manor Royal-Gatwick cycle route - £2m
 - 3A – Manor Royal “Gigabit” connectivity / business park - £1.95m
 - 4A – Crawley Town Centre Cultural Quarter design - £250,000
 - 4B – Manor Royal Business Environment Improvements £1.5m
 - 4C – “Green Retrofit” decarbonisation of homes in Crawley - £4m

- b) to allocate up to £500,000 of Towns Fund revenue funding to the following Towns Fund projects, subject to a viable business case and to the receipt of the government funding.
 - 1B – “Invest in Skills for Crawley” - Skills training facilities - £100,000
 - 1D – Commercial Eastern Gateway design - £150,000
 - 3A – Manor Royal “Gigabit” connectivity / business park - £50,000
 - 4A – Crawley Town Centre Cultural Quarter design - £200,000

7. Metcalf Way Depot and Workshop - Redevelopment - PART B (Recommendation 2)

The Deputy Mayor informed the Full Council that it was also the intention to hold the discussion on Recommendation 2 – Extension Metcalf Way and Workshop – Redevelopment (report HPS/31 of the Head of Major Projects and Commercial Services) from the Cabinet held on 16 March 2022 in Open – Public Session (Part A), noting that the report was an exempt report.

The Leader of the Council introduced the item which had sought agreement for progressing the redevelopment of the depot and workshop at Metcalf Way, project analysis and feasibility, together with the finances required. It was recognised that the Metcalf Way Depot was currently under-utilised, and Neighbourhood Services intended to continue the move to a more dispersed model of smaller neighbourhood patch depots. The recommendations supported the move to more localised depots and facilitated redevelopment of the Metcalf Way site and it was hoped a further seminar would be arranged. The recommendations were seconded by Councillor Jhans who advised that a Councillor seminar on the redevelopment would be arranged as soon as practicable.

Councillors Crow, McCarthy and Burrett also spoke on this item.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves the following items:

- a) to increase the capital programme by £995,000 funded from the capital programme reserve to fund the next stage of the scheme. In so doing, support the endorsement of the redevelopment of the Metcalf Way Depot.
- b) that £300,000 be transferred from the General Fund Reserve to the Transformation and Project Delivery reserve and the rental in the short term is funded from this reserve.

8. Code of Conduct for Councillors (Recommendation 3)

Councillor McCarthy, introduced report [LDS/178](#) of the Head of Legal, Governance and HR which identified some minor changes to the Code of Conduct for Councillors ("the Code") and confirmed the procedure for dealing with complaints under the Code. The changes proposed incorporated some of the elements from the Local Government Association's (LGA) Model Code of Conduct and formalised the Council's current process for dealing with complaints, including that any individual who was the subject of a complaint would be informed of the complaint made against them. The report was seconded by Councillor Lunnon.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves the minor changes proposed in Appendix A (Code of Conduct for Councillors) and Appendix B (Procedure for Dealing with Code of Conduct Complaints) to report [LDS/178](#) for incorporation in the Council's Constitution in time for the new municipal year, namely from the 9 May 2022.

9. Outside Bodies (Recommendation 4)

Councillor McCarthy, introduced the item, which had sought to adopt that, where the Council makes an appointment to an Outside Body with two or more Council representatives, at least one position was given to each of the largest political Groups on the Council (where those Groups had made a nomination), and that the Constitution be amended to reflect that arrangement. Further to receiving feedback from several Outside Bodies it was noted that the majority did not place importance on political proportionality but were keen that any representative appointed was engaged in its cause and attended its meetings. The item was seconded by Councillor Lunnon.

Councillor Crow also spoke on the item.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council agrees that when the Full Council, normally at the Annual Meeting, appoints representatives to a Council Outside Body with two or more Council

seats, at least one position is given to each of the largest political Groups on the Council (where those Groups have made a nomination), and that the Constitution be amended to reflect this arrangement.

10. Notification of Decision Protected from Call-In (Recommendation 5)

The Leader, Councillor Lamb introduced the item, which was set out on page 3 of the Agenda. Councillor Lamb had recently used the Urgent Action decision making powers set out in the Constitution and had also protected the decision from Call-In (in accordance with Call-In Procedure Rule 8).

The decision, which was taken on 15 March 2022, was to approve the Council Tax Government Discretionary 'Energy Rebate' Guidelines and gave delegated authority to designated senior officers to make relief awards within those Guidelines. The decision was protected from Call-In so that an online application process could become live to enable the Council to start supporting eligible residents as soon as possible. The decision was reported in Councillors' Information Bulletin [IB/1122](#).

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

Councillor Crow also spoke on this item.

RESOLVED

The Full Council notes the use of the Protection from Call-In provision by the Chief Executive in respect of the decisions taken by the Leader of the Council relating to the approval Council Tax Government Discretionary 'Energy Rebate' Guidelines and give delegated authority to designated senior officers to make relief awards within these Guidelines which were taken on 15 March 2022.

11. Notification of Urgent Action Taken by the Returning Officer: Polling Place for Three Bridges Ward (LMC) - (Recommendation 6)

Councillor McCarthy introduced the item, which was set out on page 3 of the Agenda. The Chief Executive (as Returning Officer) took a decision under the Urgency provisions as set out in the Constitution.

The designated Polling Place for Poling District LMC in Three Bridges was the Holiday Inn Express however, the Council had not been able to make a confirmed booking with Holiday Inn Express to accommodate a Polling Place for the election on 5 May 2022. In light of this, on 17 March 2022, the Chief Executive took the urgent decision to temporarily allocate the Limelight Room at The Hawth Theatre as the Polling Place for Polling District LMC for the 5 May 2022 election only. It was acknowledged that the decision was urgent due to the deadline for the polling cards to be printed and issued as these would document the voting location as required under legislation.

Councillor McCarthy informed the Full Council that the Governance Committee had debated the Urgent decision at its meeting held on 21 March 2022 and in doing so had requested that it be fed back to the Returning Officer that, in future, where an

urgent change to a Polling Place was necessary, Ward Councillors should be informed. The item was seconded by Lunnon.

Councillors BJ Burgess, Nawaz, RG Burgess also spoke on this item.

RESOLVED

The Full Council notes the Urgent Action taken by the Chief Executive (as Returning Officer) in respect of the temporary change to the Polling Place for Polling District LMC (Three Bridges) for the 5 May 2022 election, which was taken on 17 March 2022.

12. Councillors' Questions Time

Name of Councillor asking Question	Name of Cabinet Member Responding
<p>Councillor Crow to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development -</p> <p><i>As this is Councillor Smith's last Full Council meeting I would like to wish you well and a happy retirement. In your early days you often talked about the market and how you would like to do more for the market. Prior to 2014 the market was in the High Street and it is now near the Bus Station and McDonald's but not moved to Queensway as planned in the Town Centre Regeneration Programme. We did have the Council act as the operator for several years. Do you think you could have done more to improve the market and do you have any words for your successor to get the market in a good place to bring more people in?</i></p> <p>Supplementary Question – <i>The market move would cost money to move to Queensway. Surely that should have been considered when formulating the plans as we have spent money on being able to accommodate the market but it has yet to move. Does he have any idea on how long it may take and long is the Council likely to remain the operator as it is a cost to the Council?</i></p>	<p>Councillor P Smith, Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development -</p> <p><i>Thank you Councillor Crow. The work we have done on the Town Centre Regeneration Programme did include provision for a new market and we did take over the running of it in 2014. As part of the design of the Queensway and The Pavement we have included the technology, fixtures and fittings for the market to be located there and we have had reports as to how a bigger market could be run which could complement the existing businesses. Unfortunately there is not sufficient funds to roll out the market in an efficient way and it needs to be economically viable for the stallholders and the town. Footfall in the town is already returning to 2019 levels.</i></p> <p><i>We have worked in partnership with the LEP and WSCC. In terms of planning ahead we have a range of ambitious items to improve the town but it is a challenging time. There is a plan, but there are currently no revenue funds so I'm not able to say when we will be able to roll it out.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Bob Burgess to the Leader</p>	<p>Councillor Lamb, Leader of the Council -</p>

<p>of the Council -</p> <p><i>Last week the new housing development which has been called Geraint Thomas House was officially opened. This is a development that I have personally welcomed, providing much needed accommodation in a town that continues to grow. I also believe that only two Councillors were in attendance at this opening namely yourself and Councillor Irvine. The Constitution in section 6.5 states “When an opening ceremony or photo opportunity is being held in an individual ward to mark the opening or installation of a new or upgraded facility or service provision, all Councillors representing that ward will be invited to attend and take part in the event”. This does not seem to have happened. I, as one of the Ward Councillors, did not receive an invitation to attend and neither did my colleague Councillor BJ Burgess. I cannot vouch for the third Ward Councillor, Councillor Nawaz. Why were the invitations not forthcoming?</i></p> <p><i>Supplementary Question – The Constitution does say “any new or upgraded facility or service provision”. Also was the family consulted regarding the Council’s Constitution?</i></p>	<p><i>The building is an A2Dominion property and not that of Crawley Borough Council. The guest list was personally decided by Geraint’s family.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Eade to the Cabinet Member for Housing -</p> <p><i>Are you aware that Mears contractor vans are parking on grass verges in Furnace Green? There is a particular van has been there Monday, Tuesday and today (I have a photo). Are you concerned?</i></p> <p><i>Supplementary Question – Will Councillor Irvine be telling Mears and any other contractors not to park on the grass verges?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Irvine, Cabinet Member for Housing –</p> <p><i>I’m concerned about any vehicle that parks on any grass verge. To see how any of our verges get disfigured is horrifying. I’m grateful to Councillor Eade for bringing this up. This has been brought up at a previous meeting and the then Head of Crawley Homes did act on this and bring it to Mears’ attention. Please send me the photo and I will get something done about it. I do share your concerns.</i></p> <p><i>I will make sure that the message gets back. If this happens again let me know. It is a deplorable practice.</i></p>

<p>Councillor Jaggard to the Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>I believe several Councillors have been having issues with the Council Outlook and email system due to an update malfunction which is causing residents not being able to contact Councillors. Is this a wider issue across departments where resident's queries are going unanswered and if so when will it be sorted out?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb, Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>We are doing a major upgrade to the system as, about a month ago, there was a significant data breach. Where emails have been dropped as a result that is a problem and we are very apologetic. Once the system is back we should have a more secure system. I would recommend that, if people are having issues, that they use the webmail version of Outlook which seems to be more reliable.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Tina Belben to the Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>Following my question at the last ordinary meeting of the Full Council, as I understand it, £254,000 was paid to sub-contractors as sick pay and this exceeded the budget by £154,000. But I also asked what's been put in the budgets 2022/23 and 2023/24 for this sub contractors' sick pay and are the figures in line with what the likely cost of what was quoted to the Full Council in 2019 please?</i></p> <p>Supplementary Question – <i>I was interested to see what we had been budgeted for but perhaps if I could have an email sometime? Thank you.</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb, Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>So the figures quoted in 2019 established that sick pay would be roughly £100,000 per year as part of that contract and it has been exceeded. However obviously encouraging people to stay at home whilst sick during the pandemic was the best thing for tenants rather than encouraging them into people's homes. I don't have a specific element of the budget for next year that has been increased, the overall figure is £1.77m increase.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Brenda Burgess to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services for Sustainability –</p> <p><i>I apologise if this has already been asked but have we named something after Alan Quine? Where will it be?</i></p> <p>Supplementary Question – <i>Is there a timescale and are the family satisfied with that approach?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jhans, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Sustainability-</p> <p><i>Communications have been taking place with the family to discuss a suitable location. Road names in Forge Wood are a potential. It is on the list and in the process.</i></p> <p><i>I can chase up on timescale but can assure you that communications have been ongoing with the family.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Bounds to the Cabinet</p>	<p>Councillor Jhans, Cabinet Member for</p>

<p>Member for Environmental Services for Sustainability -</p> <p><i>The 'my- permit' scheme was rolled out at Fisherman's car park at Tilgate last year. Footfall in the town centre is starting to increase. Is the Council looking to roll out further pay by app /phone across the town in order to improve customer experience?</i></p>	<p>Environmental Services and Sustainability-</p> <p><i>We are looking into this. We have rollout a car share scheme in the town and if that proves to be successful we would look to expand this also.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Ali to the Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>The past couple of years have been difficult for Crawley businesses. How many applications have the Council received for the latest batch of additional restrictions grant and how many businesses of self-employed people received money in the latest batch? I can email you the detailed questions if you would prefer.</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb, Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>I'll happily get back to you with the information.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Millar-Smith to the Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>I think the point has been missed with Councillor Burgess and the inviting of Councillors to events. It is more a general statement, regarding Ward Councillors being invited to events which has been raised several times before. Why do Ward Councillors keep having to raise this issue regardless of the circumstances around the most recent event?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Lamb, Leader of the Council -</p> <p><i>I can accept the principal is that Ward Members are supposed to be invited to the opening of a Crawley Borough Council facility or a major upgrade of those facilities. That is what the Council's Communications team are instructed to follow.</i></p>

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

RESOLVED

That the following reports be received:

Licensing – 1 March 2022
 Planning Committee – 8 March 2022
 Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 14 March 2022
 Audit Committee – 15 March 2022
 Cabinet – 16 March 2022
 Governance Committee – 21 March 2022

The following item which was not a Recommendation to the Full Council was selected as an Item for Debate:

Agenda Page no.	Committee/ Minute no.	Item
p.66	Licensing Committee 1 March 2022 (Minute 4) Councillor Crow	Review of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy (Consultation Feedback).

14. Item for Debate - Review of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy (Consultation Feedback) - Licensing Committee, 1 March 2022 (Minute 4)

Councillor Malik declared a personal and prejudicial interest, left the room and took no part in the debate.

Councillor Crow then explained the rationale for bringing this item for debate and raised concerns regarding the recent decision taken at the Licensing Committee. Councillor Crow stressed that he was speaking as an individual Councillor and not on behalf of the Conservative Group. It was recognised that the Council had declared a climate emergency and also more recently voted on reducing its emissions and net zero targets. Older vehicles potentially generated greater emissions than those of newer vehicles.

Although Councillor Crow acknowledged it was admirable to assist small businesses, he emphasised that public safety standards of the service were of paramount importance and, whilst vehicles over 4 years of age must undergo six-monthly Certificate of Compliance checks, it was felt that granting a further age limit extension could leave the Council open to potential legal challenge which could potentially be problematic.

Both support and opposition of the Licensing Committee's resolution was expressed with Councillors, McCarthy, Jones, T Belben, C Mullins, BJ Burgess, Ayling, Lamb, Ali, Nawaz and Buck speaking on the item. Those in support of the resolution emphasised that the Licensing Committee had considered the issue in depth and had asked relevant questions of officers before the decision was taken. They maintained that many licensed drivers had experienced a loss of earnings throughout the Covid-19 pandemic and it was considered important to assist small businesses when the Council was able to do so. A further extension may allow those whose vehicles were approaching 11 years old more time to recuperate earnings before needing to purchase a new vehicle. It was also acknowledged that the Certificate of Compliance checks and MOTs were in place to ensure the safety of passengers. Those against the resolution were of the opinion that the safety of passengers should be the primary focus of the Council as Licensing Authority and were of the view that extending the age limit of taxis was contrary to that.

Councillor Jaggard responded on this item as Chair of the Licensing Committee and expressed her disappointment with the decision taken by the Committee. The item had summarised the results of the consultation process on a policy that promoted public safety, which was the primary purpose of the licensing regime. Concern had been raised that there had been an increase in MOT advisories in the last year. With

regards to the consultation itself, although there had been 57 respondents to the (both taxi drivers and residents) only 3 people had commented upon the age of the vehicles. The rationale for the further extension was the loss of earnings, however many businesses had suffered during the pandemic and drivers could have taken advantage of the government business grants or SORN their vehicles off the road. Nevertheless, the 12 month extension had been considered and carried by the Committee.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Full Council concluded, the Deputy Mayor declared the meeting closed at 9.41 pm

M Flack
(Deputy Mayor)

This page is intentionally left blank

Disclosures of Interest**Appendix A**

Councillor	Item and Minute	Meeting	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor Jaggard	Objections to the Crawley Borough Council Tree Preservation Order – 6 Wilson Close – 07/2021 (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 8 March 2022	Personal Interest – had correspondence with interested parties and had previously expressed an opinion on the matter
Councillor Burrett	Town Centre Regeneration Programme Third Edition (Minute 5)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	Town Centre Regeneration Programme Third Edition (Minute 5)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	Town Centre Regeneration Programme Third Edition (Minute 5)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member Crawley Growth Programme
Councillor Burrett	Crawley Towns Fund Project Business Case (Minute 7)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	Crawley Towns Fund Project Business Case (Minute 7)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	Crawley Towns Fund Project Business Case (Minute 7)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member Crawley Growth Programme
Councillor Burrett	HASC (Minute 9)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	HASC (Minute 9)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC

Councillor Lanzer	HASC (Minute 9)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 14 March 2022	Personal Interest – WSCC Cabinet Member for Public Health & Wellbeing
Councillor Burrett	Town Centre Regeneration Programme Third Edition (Minute 7)	Cabinet 16 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burrett	Allocating Monies Collected Through CIL (Minute 8)	Cabinet 16 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burrett	West Sussex County Council and Crawley Borough Council Agency Agreement in relation to Civil Parking Enforcement (Minute 10)	Cabinet 16 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burrett	Crawley Towns Fund Project Business (Minute 12)	Cabinet 16 March 2022	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burrett	Outside Bodies (Minute 7)	Governance Committee 21 March 2022	Personal Interest – He was a Trustee of Crawley Open House (not a Council representative appointed by the Council)
Councillor Lamb	Councillors' Allowances Scheme: Update (Minute 6)	Governance Committee 21 March 2022	Personal Interest – His partner was the current Deputy Mayor
Councillor Lunnon	Notification of Urgent Action Taken by the Returning Officer: Polling Place for Three Bridges Ward (LMC) (Minute 9)	Governance Committee 21 March 2022	Personal Interest – He was a member of Three Bridges Cricket Club
Councillor Malik	Item for Debate - Review of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy (Consultation Feedback) - Licensing Committee, 1 March 2022 (Minute 4) (Minute 14)	Full Council 30 March 2022	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest – He was a Licensed Taxi Driver