

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Full Council

Wednesday, 29 March 2023 at 7.45 pm

Councillors Present:

J Hart (Mayor)

T Rana (Deputy Mayor)

Z Ali, M L Ayling, T G Belben, J Bounds, S Buck, B J Burgess, R D Burrett, D Crow, H Hellier, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, G S Jhans, K Khan, Y Khan, M G Jones, P K Lamb, R A Lanzer, T Lunnon, K McCarthy, C J Mullins, S Mullins, M Mwagale, A Nawaz, B Noyce, D M Peck, A Pendlington, S Piggott, S Pritchard, S Raja and S Sivarajah

Also in Attendance:

Mr Peter Nicolson Independent Person

Mr Russell Brown Independent Person

Officers Present:

Natalie Brahma-Pearl Chief Executive

Siraj Choudhury Head of Governance, People & Performance

Ian Duke Deputy Chief Executive

Heather Girling Democratic Services Officer

Chris Pedlow Democracy & Data Manager

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor S Malik, J Millar-Smith and M Morris

1. Disclosures of Interest

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

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 22 February 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

3. Communications

The Mayor presented each of the following Councillors with a badge commemorating their long service as a Member of Crawley Borough Council and thanked them for their long and dedicated service with this Authority:-

Award Name:
30 Years – Councillor Chris Mullins
20 Years – Councillor Duncan Crow

The Mayor then provided the Full Council with a brief update of the Mayoral events attended since the last meeting which included visiting the District Heat Network, the official opening of the New Town Hall and a youth dance festival at the Hawth.

4. Public Question Time

Questioner's Name	Name of Councillor Responding
<p><i>Richard Symonds, Ifield</i> (Whilst indicating water pollution on a map within Bewbush Brook to the Full Council)</p> <p>The pollution is a concern therefore my question is, with large housing developments taking place (and proposed) within the ancient Parish of Ifield, what steps are being taken by this Council to protect Bewbush Brook - and beyond - from further contamination and pollution?</p> <p><u>Supplementary</u> – On a scale of 1 to 10 [Low risk = 1 High Risk = 10], how dangerous do you consider this to be in the future?</p>	<p><i>Councillor Nawaz</i> (<i>Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development</i>):</p> <p>Thank you for your question. As you are aware as a council we are against any new developments and we have submitted our strongest challenge. We can look into the contamination and can investigate this further. I will endeavour to find out further detail regarding water pollution and contamination and submit this to you.</p> <p>I think that this will require a technical response. I will seek detailed information from officers and respond to you.</p>
<p><i>Francis Guidera, Northgate</i></p> <p>As I am currently live streaming this on Facebook, I'm aware that when I previously sat in the old town hall, we had a lockdown situation and we used the tablets to live stream the meetings on MS Teams. I feel these meetings are important, and the point that was made by the previous question asker would be useful if it was in the public realm. I just wondered what the situation was for putting these meetings live for public viewing going forward?</p>	<p><i>Councillor Jones</i> (<i>Leader of the Council</i>)</p> <p>We will be discussing the arrangements for webcasting all council meetings in public later in the agenda. It is the hope we will be able to implement this in time for the AGM but that is not a 'cast iron' promise due to the fitout requirements.</p>

5. Recommendation 1 – Waste and Recycling Contract (PART B)

The Full Council considered HPS/034 and HPS/034a of the Head of Major Projects and Commercial Services. It was agreed to hold the debate on this recommendation in open session even though it related to a Part B exempt item. The Leader, Councillor Jones, introduced the report which had requested approval to extend the contract to the waste and recycling service and the replacement of the refuse vehicle fleet with a view to new vehicles coming into operation at the beginning of the extension period.

It was highlighted this would enable the Council the continuity of the waste and recycling service, ensure the waste vehicle fleet was operating efficiently and fit for purpose and would assist in maintaining the delivery of service benefits to residents. The arrangement allowed the Council to assess options for transitional arrangements to the local waste collection arrangements in response to the National Waste Strategy which the Government had indicated would be released in the 'near future' along with addressing the Council's own environmental targets.

The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Jhans.

Councillor Crow then moved and presented [Amendment 1](#) (as shown in the Supplementary Agenda Order Paper on page 21). The Amendment was seconded by Councillor Jaggard who also spoke on the item.

Councillor Jones, using the right to reply, commented that he would accept Councillor's Crow's amendment and include it as part of the substantive recommendation. The Mayor then called for a vote on the amendment, which was carried unanimously. The Mayor then called for a vote on the substantive recommendation as amended which was also carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

- a) That Full Council approves the supplementary capital estimate of £3m for the procurement of a new refuse fleet funded by:
 - £1.6m from the Refuse Vehicle Replacement Reserve
 - £0.18m from the Waste and Recycling Reserve
 - £1.22m from the Capital Programme Reserve

- b) With a view to replicating if viable, the Council will seek feedback from other local authorities who are using Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil (HVO) instead of diesel to fuel their refuse vehicles, in particular Wealden District Council who announced on 16 March 2023 a year-long trial, a move that is expected to reduce net carbon emissions from each vehicle by up to 90%.

6. Recommendation 2 – Review of the Constitution – Appointment of Independent Member(s) to the Audit Committee

The Full Council considered report [LDS/197](#) of the Head of Governance, People and Performance. Councillor Lamb as Chair of Governance Committee introduced the report which recommended, following CIPFA advice, that an independent member be co-opted as a non-voting member to the Audit Committee for the 2023/24 municipal

year. The independent member would be unable to hold the position of either the Chair or Vice Chair of the Audit Committee, however they would have a strong 'financial background' to assist in providing a critical friend/challenge role.

The recommendation was seconded and supported by Councillor Bounds.

Councillors Burrett and Belben also spoke on this item.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the recommendation which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council

- a) approves that an independent member be co-opted as a non-voting member to the Audit Committee as of the 2023/24 municipal year, with the independent member being unable to hold the position of either the Chair or Vice Chair of the Audit Committee.
- b) delegates the recruitment process of the co-optee independent Audit Member to the Head of Governance, People & Performance in consultation with the Section 151 Officer and the Chief Executive, with the proposed co-optee nominee being brought to Full Council for final appointment.

7. Recommendation 3 – Review of the Constitution – Allocation of Chairs and Vice Chair of Committees

The Full Council considered report [LDS/197](#) of the Head of Governance, People and Performance. Councillor Lamb, as Chair of the Governance Committee, presented section 6 of the report which detailed an amendment to the existing allocation to Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs (the fixed cascade approach) and proposed that the positions of Chair and Vice Chair for each Committee should be elected by a simple majority at the Annual Meeting of the Full Council. The appointment of the Chair and Vice Chair of a Committee should not include Councillors from the same political group (where possible). The proposal was seconded by Councillor Pritchard.

Councillors Crow, Irvine, Lanzer, K Khan, Burrett, Jones and McCarthy all spoke on the item.

Councillor Nawaz moved a Procedural Motion 11.1 (m), *That the item/issue now be voted upon – (specifically immediately ending the debate on the item and hold the vote on the item)*, which was seconded by Councillor S Mullins.

The Mayor ruled that the moved Procedural Motion 11.1 (m) was valid and thus called for the vote on the Procedural Motion.

RESOLVED

That the item/issue now be voted upon – (specifically immediately end the debate on the Notice of Motion and then hold the vote on the Motion).

The Mayor called for the vote on Recommendation 3: Review of the Constitution – Allocation of Chairs and Vice Chairs of Committees. A recorded vote was requested, and the Mayor invited the Democracy and Data Manager to commence the recorded voting process.

For: Councillors Ayling, Buck, Hart, Irvine, Jhans, Jones, K Khan, Y Khan, Lamb, Lunnon, C Mullins, S Mullins, Nawaz, Noyce, Pritchard, Raja, Rana and Sivarajah (18)

Against: Councillors Ali, Belben, Bounds, Burgess, Burrett, Crow, Hellier, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Mwangale, Peck, Pendlington, Piggott (14)

Abstentions: None (0)

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approved that Constitution, Part 2, Section 6.2 Chair and Vice Chair of Committees be replaced with the following:

“Chair and Vice Chair of Committees: The positions of Chair and Vice Chair for each Committee shall be elected by a simple majority at the Annual Meeting of the Full Council. The appointment of the Chair and Vice Chair of a Committee should not include Councillors from the same political group (where possible).”

8. Recommendation 4 – Review of the Constitution – Webcasting Formal Meetings of the Council

Councillor Lamb as Chair of the Governance Committee introduced the item to the Full Council, which featured in section 7 of report [LDS/197](#). As all formal meetings were now able to take place in the new town hall, it was anticipated that webcasting functionality could be incorporated into the building. It was noted that whilst the functionality was available, the installation and necessary training still needed to occur and therefore it was anticipated that meetings would (with the exception of Employment Panel, Grants Appeal Panel and exempt sessions) be web cast as soon as possible, subject to cost and practicality. It was noted the retention period for webcast recordings needed to align with the Council's current retention protocol and GDPR requirements and therefore it was proposed that recordings be retained for a minimum of six months after the meeting took place.

The recommendation was supported and seconded by Councillor Bounds.

Councillors Crow, Jones, Burrett, Pritchard, Lanzer, S Mullins, Bounds and McCarthy spoke on the item.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves:

- a) that once the necessary functionality is available, all formal meetings of the Council (with the exception of the Employment Panel and Grants Appeal Panel), subject to cost and practicality, be webcast as soon as possible.

- b) that the recordings of webcast meetings be retained for a minimum of six months after the meeting takes place.
- c) that the Head of Governance, People & Performance be delegated authority to make any necessary consequential amendments to the Council's Constitution.

9. Recommendation 5 – Review of the Constitution – Protocol on the Appointment of Honorary Aldermen and Honorary Freemen

Councillor Lamb as Chair of the Governance Committee introduced the item to the Full Council, which featured in section 8 of report [LDS/197](#). The report proposed a revision to the Protocol on the Appointment of Honorary Aldermen and Honorary Freemen. The main reason for the review was linked to the statute that required a two thirds Full Council majority for the Appointment of Honorary Aldermen and Honorary Freemen, which was not currently covered in the protocol. Neither Protocol had been revised for a significant number of years and it was the only section of the current Constitution that had not been revised during the review in 2019. The proposed revision was welcomed.

The recommendation was supported and seconded by Councillor Bounds.

Councillors Jones, Burgess and Burrett spoke on the item.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves the revised Protocol on Appointment of Honorary Aldermen/Women or Honorary Freemen/Women which is set out as Appendix B to the minutes.

10. Recommendation 6 - Appointment of Deputy Registration Officers

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Jones, introduced report [CEX/62](#), which was set out on page 3 of the Full Council agenda. The Electoral Services Manager (Andrew Oakley), who currently held the Council's statutory designation of Deputy Electoral Registration Officer, would be retiring in early June 2023. Councillor Jones took the opportunity to thank Andrew for his hard work, diligence, and support. To comply with the requirement under Section 52(2) of the Representation of the People Act 1983, the Full Council welcomed the two proposed appointments for Deputy Electoral Registration Officers, of Jill Rozier (Lead Electoral Services Officer) and Chris Pedlow (Democracy and Data Manager) to take effect from 1 April 2023.

Councillor Jones then moved the recommendation, which was seconded and supported by Councillor Crow, who also thanked Andrew for his support over the years and wished him well.

RESOLVED

That Full Council appoints Jill Rozier (Lead Electoral Services Officer) and Chris Pedlow (Democracy & Data Manager) as Deputy Electoral Registration Officers from 1 April 2023.

11. Notice of Motion 1- Motion Opposing London Ulez Expansion

The Council considered the Notice of Motion 1 '[Opposing London Ulez Expansion](#)' - as set out on page 65 of the agenda.

The Motion was moved and presented by Councillor Crow, who in doing so gave further explanation of the reasoning behind the Motion. It was seconded and supported by Councillor Burrett.

Councillor Jones then moved and presented [Amendment 1](#) (as shown in the Supplementary Agenda Order Paper). The Amendment was seconded by Councillor Jhans.

A single debate occurred on both the recommendation and the proposed amendment. Councillors Ali, Irvine, and Jhans all spoke during the debate.

Councillor Crow used the right to reply to speak at the end of the debate. A recorded vote was requested on the amendment and the Mayor invited the Democracy and Data Manager to commence the recorded voting process.

For the Amendment: Councillors Ayling, Buck, Hart, Irvine, Jhans, Jones, K Khan, Y Khan, Lamb, Lunnon, C Mullins, S Mullins, Nawaz, Noyce, Pritchard, Raja, Rana and Sivarajah (18)

Against the Amendment: Councillors Ali, Belben, Bounds, Burgess, Burrett, Crow, Hellier, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Mwangale, Peck, Pendlington, Piggott (14)

Abstentions: None (0)

The Mayor declared that the proposed amendment was carried – votes in favour 18 and votes against 14, with 0 abstentions.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the substantive Notice of Motion as amended.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council notes that:

The London Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) currently covers the area within the North and South Circular Roads only.

The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, plans to extend the ULEZ to cover all London Boroughs from 29 August 2023.

On Thursday 16 February 2023, a coalition of five councils opposed to the ULEZ expansion, comprising four outer London Boroughs (Bexley, Bromley, Harrow and Hillingdon) and Surrey County Council, launched a Judicial Review to challenge TfL and the Mayor of London's decision to expand the ULEZ to outer London boroughs.

The proposed ULEZ extension would mean its outer boundary would apply from Farthing Way (the A23) in Coulsdon, which is only 11.9 miles away from Crawley's boundary on the M23 at Junction 9 near Gatwick, which can be a drive of under 15 minutes.

The daily charge to enter the London ULEZ is £12.50 for vehicles that are not exempt, with the penalty for not paying set to rise to £180.

The charge is levied from midnight to midnight, meaning that non-exempt vehicles entering the zone in the evening and exiting after midnight would be charged £25 for one trip to anywhere in London.

Many Crawley residents have a need to travel by car to outer London Boroughs for a variety of purposes, including work and specialist hospital appointments.

Residents on lower incomes are more likely to own older vehicles that are not exempt from paying the ULEZ charge.

That Full Council approves:

To seek advice on the ULEZ expansion scheme from West Sussex County Council as the local authority in the area for dealing with highways and transport-related matters and from the Council's Sustainability and Climate Emergency teams and for the motion as originally worded by the proposer and seconder to be referred to the Full Council Meeting in July 2023 for a decision.

12. Councillors' Questions Time

<p><i>Councillor Crow to the Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>We are approaching his first year as Leader and a year of his Cabinet and my observations are there could have been room for improvement. We saw in the Councillors' Information Bulletin that the Cabinet would be increasing from 7 to 8 members, but that entails an increase in members' allowances, which would result (with National Insurance) in nearly £9000 a year extra to Cabinet Members. What is the rationale for increasing the size of the Cabinet noting the new roles and responsibilities within the Cabinet - are they any reflection on the changes proposed to the ASB and Community Wardens teams?</p>	<p><i>Councillor Jones, Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>Thank you for your question. However, the last review of the executive function delegation was some time ago now under Councillor Lamb's tenure and it now required further consideration. The Public Protection and Community Engagement portfolio was particularly large, and I having had the role am aware of this. It is diverse but also issues relating to crime, public safety and anti-social behaviour have become an increase public concern. In order to increase public confidence there needs to be a stronger interaction with the police and our partners and this will focus on community cohesion and I believe that is worthy of £9000. I believe this town should have a cultural strategy and there are several opportunities including Arts Council funding together with events taking place including a film festival at the Hawth this August. The change in Cabinet function will assist in optimising the opportunities for Crawley, including member involvement which is important.</p>
--	---

13. Vote to Extend the Meeting (Guillotine)

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

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

14. Councillors' Question Time (continued)

<p><i>Councillor Crow to the Leader of the Council</i> <u>Supplementary –</u></p> <p>I thank the Leader for his answer and he mentioned he had previously been appointed to the Cabinet Member role for Public Protection and Community Engagement. Furthermore he mentioned when Councillor Lamb was Leader there was a Cabinet of 7 members (and for some time 6 members). My question is, if the previous Leader was able to manage with 6, and 7 members, why is there a need for 8?</p>	<p><i>Councillor Jones, Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>I was a member of Councillor Lamb's Cabinet in the past and I believe that Cabinet was fit for the task it was given. However, things in our borough change and we need to change in order to respond to those challenges. I believe that public safety and anti-social behaviour are becoming increasingly concerning for the public and we need to respond. I have chosen not to appoint to the Public Protection portfolio until the election.</p>
<p><i>Councillor Ali to the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement and Culture</i></p> <p>I would like to thank you for providing the information published but whilst sitting here I have just calculated the cost for the whole of the Winter Warmer project. I have calculated it costs approximately £303 per visit. There were quite a few of these sessions of which I visited and unfortunately there weren't many people in attendance. Is it the best use of tax payers' money with 59 sessions and £303 per visit?</p> <p><u>Supplementary –</u> The data provided does not say there were sessions provided in Pound Hill or Maidenbower. However, my supplementary is that most people went to the Broadfield community centre, and I</p>	<p><i>Councillor S Mullins, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement and Culture</i></p> <p>We are in the middle of a cost of living, food and energy crisis and this isn't just for those on low incomes. There are lots of people who are struggling and we looked at what the council could do to help and we needed to do act quickly, which is what lots of other councils did around the country. There are areas of deprivation across the town and I'm amazed at the response we received for support to ensure there was some kind of provision in every area of the town. The uptake wasn't huge as sometimes it is hard to admit when you need help but it was a great initiative and the council did the right thing in supporting the community.</p> <p>I visited the Broadfield community centre and did a radio broadcast from there. I then visited Broadfield library to enquire if the library would be running a warm hub and the facilities could be used. Unfortunately, I was informed the library</p>

<p>visited this a few times. But just across the road is Broadfield library and I wondered was there a collaboration with WSCC to use this or any discussion regarding a winter warmer session there?</p>	<p>would not be running a warm hub and WSCC would have its own scheme in due course if it would be considered necessary. Broadfield library was also going to be closed the week after Christmas for a refurb.</p>
<p><i>Councillor Brenda Burgess to the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement and Culture</i></p> <p>I attended Crawley Question Time the other week and there was a lot of discussion about young people and there was concern that we have a Youth Council but unfortunately there was no representation so I'd just wondered how we can engage with the Youth Council and get them interested in what we do, could we have a report about what they've been doing, or know about the Youth Mayor's events. How do we engage more with them?</p>	<p><i>Councillor Jones, Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>We did invite a representative from the Youth Council to be on the Crawley Question Time Panel but unfortunately, they sent their apologies at late notice. However we would continue to include young people in the future. Probably your average teenager does not want to sit in a room of sexagenarians and septuagenarians discussing planning issues so there is an issue about engagement.</p> <p><i>Councillor S Mullins, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement and Culture</i></p> <p>During the summer we had the elections to the Youth Council and the first meeting of their council took place in the new Town Hall a few weeks ago. They are passionate about the issues that are important to them. I would encourage all councillors to find out more about the Youth Council.</p>
<p><i>Councillor Jaggard to the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Wellbeing</i></p> <p>I've been contacted by an elderly resident who attends the Pilates class at K2 Crawley on a Friday. The class costs £3.30 which is billed automatically to their bank account. If there is an event in the main hall, the class is moved into the studio. The resident has found out that when this change of venue is made by K2 Crawley, the charge increases to £7.00 which is over double and apparently is because the studio is classed a premium room. What do you as Cabinet member think of this charge and do you think it's acceptable?</p> <p>Can I just add that the election count is on a Friday and can we ensure that all residents are not charged double.</p>	<p><i>Councillor C Mullins, Cabinet Member for Leisure and Wellbeing</i></p> <p>I'm surprised it's happening. It hasn't come to me as a complaint. If you can send me an email with further details, I'll take it up with the officer who manages the contract.</p>

<p><i>Councillor Lanzer to the Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>The last Full Council was on 22 February and I'll refer to 5 questions that were tabled briefly. Councillor Hellier asked a question on fly tipping, waste and fines – received a response today (29 March). Councillor Piggott asked a question on a searchable database for tree preservation orders. Has yet to receive a response 35 days later. I asked a question to Councillor Jhans on the High Weald Outstanding Area of Natural Beauty and received a response this Tuesday (28 March). Councillor Burrett asked Councillor C Mullins about the artificial cricket pitch and received a response this Monday (27 March). Councillor Jaggard asked Councillor C Mullins about the Maidenbower community centre. Has yet to receive a response. There are 5 questions, 2 of which are still outstanding and 3 of which the responses were just prior to Full Council. What are your thoughts as to the response time for such important public questions?</p>	<p><i>Councillor Jones, Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>Thank you for your question. It is very difficult depending on the complexity of the question and the need to complete the necessary research. Clearly some time has passed and I will ask the Chief Executive and ensure that those questions that have not been answered are done so as a matter of urgency. We can try and work out a management system so questions that come through Full Council are maintained. I would reiterate to all members that if you have asked a question at Full Council and you feel you haven't received an answer that you come to me, rather than wait for the next Full Council meeting. Please let me know if you are outstanding on any information.</p>
<p><i>Councillor Mwangale to the Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>Have we got any signed up tenants for the top floors of the new town hall?</p>	<p><i>Councillor Jones, Leader of the Council</i></p> <p>Thank you for your question. It is difficult to provide detailed information as there is still commercial sensitivity surrounding the information. However we have significant interest with one organisation wanting to sign imminently and we are actively pursuing marketing opportunities.</p>

15. Vote to Extend the Meeting (Guillotine)

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED

That the following reports be received:

- Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 6 March 2023
- Planning Committee – 7 March 2023
- Cabinet – 8 March 2023
- Governance Committee – 13 March 2023

17. Items for Debate - Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL - Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley - Planning Committee - 7 March 2023

Councillor McCarthy, on behalf of the Conservative Group, explained the rationale for bringing forward this item for debate. Concerns were raised over the elimination of the right-hand turn from the station and the impact this would have on travel flow. The loss of the right-hand turn was problematic for those living east of the station, particularly those in Pound Hill, Maidenbower and beyond. The change would negatively impact the taxi trade, as well as the public with increased costs. Whilst it was important to ensure that all station users benefited from a new, improved scheme, sometimes the costs and sacrifices were just too high and the proposal may prove to be a mistake in the future.

Councillors Lunnon, Jaggard, Lamb and Belben also spoke on the subject.

Councillor Burrett responded on this item adding that whilst there was support for improving the station forecourt as this was paramount, unfortunately it was felt that the loss of the right-hand turn would have a negative impact on those residents who reside east of the station. It would be disappointing should the scheme have to be re-visited in the future due to the decision taken and its implications.

18. Items for Debate - Tenancy Policy Crawley Homes - Cabinet - 8 March 2023

Councillor Burrett, on behalf of the Conservative Group, explained the rationale for bringing this item forward for debate. The Flexible Tenancy Policy was introduced in 2013, during his tenure as Cabinet member, due to a government initiative. There were concerns it was being implemented too soon as the report was well balanced and provided arguments for the existing status quo, as well as providing reasons for the change to secure tenancies. Flexible tenancies could allow the council to make better use of the housing stock but it was acknowledged that the success of this had been limited (due to the limited number of flexible tenancies). However the option to 'right size' individuals/households was a benefit with flexible tenancies, assisting the housing register. It was hoped it would be a valued decision and that key aspects were not eliminated ('baby out with the bathwater').

Councillors Irvine and Buck also spoke on the item.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Full Council concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 11.11 pm

J Hart (Mayor)

This page is intentionally left blank

Disclosures of Interest**Appendix A**

Councillor	Item and Minute	Meeting	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor Ali	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 7 March 2023	Personal Interest – West Sussex County Councillor.
Councillor Burrett	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 7 March 2023	Personal Interest – West Sussex County Councillor.
Councillor Burrett	Section 106 Monies – Q3 2022/23 (Minute 6)	Planning Committee 7 March 2023	Personal Interest – West Sussex County Councillor.
Mez Matthews (<i>Democratic Services Officer</i>)	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 7 March 2023	The Head of Governance, People & Performance (as Monitoring Officer) stated that, for openness and transparency, it should be noted that the Democratic Services Officer's husband had submitted a representation in regard to the application. As the Democratic Services Officer's role was neutral and as they were not a decision maker, the Monitoring Officer was happy for them to clerk the meeting.
Councillor Lanzer	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 7 March 2023	Councillor Lanzer confirmed they were speaking as a Ward Councillor. For information, they declared they were a West Sussex County Councillor and also the Cabinet Representative on the Crawley Growth Programme. The planning

			application under consideration formed part of that Growth Programme.
Councillor Pritchard	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 7 March 2023	Councillor Pritchard stated that their employer is Govia Thameslink Railway which serves as Operator for Three Bridges Station as well as for the rest of the Thameslink, Southern, Great Northern and Gatwick Express rail franchises in England. They stated this was not a personal or pecuniary interest because the company was significantly large in size and they were not a director or shareholder. Therefore, they confirmed they had no interest to declare which would prevent them from participating and voting on the application.
Councillor Burrett	Review of the Constitution (Minute 4)	Governance Committee 13 March 2023	Personal Interest – West Sussex County Councillor.
Councillor Crow	Review of the Constitution (Minute 4)	Governance Committee 13 March 2023	Personal Interest – West Sussex County Councillor.
Councillor Lanzer	Review of the Constitution (Minute 4)	Governance Committee 13 March 2023	Personal Interest – West Sussex County Councillor.

Protocol on Appointment of Honorary Aldermen or Honorary Freemen

**PROTOCOL ON APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY ALDERMEN/WOMEN
OR HONORARY FREEMEN/WOMEN**

1. CRITERIA FOR NOMINATIONS OF HONORARY ALDERMEN/WOMEN

- 1.1. Nominees for Honorary Aldermen/women should be former Councillors who have served a minimum total length of 20 years in that capacity. Their length of service is normally substantially greater than the average length of service per Councillor. Nominees should also have given service to the wider community in a role outside of their duties as a Borough Councillor. This might include notable work with the voluntary sector, with educational bodies, with other Local Authorities covering the geographical areas of the Borough, or any other body that the Council deems appropriate.

2. CRITERIA FOR NOMINATIONS OF HONORARY FREEMEN/WOMEN

- 2.1. Nominees for Honorary Freemen/women should be either individuals that have given extraordinary service to the town over a prolonged period, or who, by their action, have brought significant distinction to the town.
- 2.2. These honours will be given infrequently as they are a reward for exceptional service.

3. PROCEDURE FOR NOMINATING HONORARY ALDERMEN/WOMEN

- 3.1. Following any Borough election, the Head of Governance, People & Performance will consult with each Group Leader to decide whether to put forward any eligible former Councillors for consideration of Honorary Alderman honours. If any names are proposed for nomination, the first Governance Committee post-Borough election will consider a report which details the names and total length of service of those former Councillors.
- 3.2. This Governance Committee would be expected to recommend that the Mayor convene an Extraordinary Meeting of the Full Council to bestow the title of Honorary Alderman/woman on those former Councillors (this Extraordinary Meeting will usually be convened to take place immediately before, or at the conclusion of, the July meeting of the Full Council).
- 3.3. Before an Extraordinary Meeting of the Full Council is convened, the Head of Governance, People & Performance will contact any nominees to ensure they would like to receive the honour.

4. PROCEDURE FOR NOMINATING HONORARY FREEMEN/WOMEN

- 4.1. Before a nomination is made, the Head of Governance, People & Performance should be contacted, who will then consult the Mayor (as a matter of courtesy) and the Leader of each political group.
- 4.2. If the Head of Governance, People & Performance is satisfied that the person nominated is likely to receive the support of the Full Council, they will take a report to the Governance Committee for its consideration.
- 4.3. This Governance Committee would be expected to recommend that the Mayor convene an Extraordinary Meeting of the Full Council to bestow the title of Honorary Freeman/woman.
- 4.4. Before any formal arrangements are made, the Head of Governance, People & Performance will contact the nominated person to ensure they would like to receive the honour.

5. APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY ALDERMEN/WOMEN OR HONORARY FREEMEN/WOMEN

- 5.1. Nominations for both Honorary Aldermen/women and Honorary Freeman/women will be considered at an Extraordinary Meeting of the Full Council which has been convened for the sole purpose of considering the nominations.
- 5.2. Any resolution by the Full Council to bestow these honours must be passed by no less than two thirds of the Councillors voting on the matter.